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Importance of Topic

Future decisions regarding the fate of library education at UCLA may be informed by the context and arguments provided herein. It is the hope of the author of this thesis that in exploring the foundational philosophies on which the School of Library Service was built and confronting the anxious predictions of even its most ardent critics, the reader will develop an appreciation for the Regents’ decision to approve the SLS, so that any future discussion of decommissioning or dismissing ALA accreditation may be strongly reconsidered.
Introduction

The idea for a professional school of librarianship at UCLA was initially met with opposition. This thesis will show that the opposition was not warranted and that over the years the school has shown its value.

Although the idea for library education at UCLA can be traced back to the early 1920s, it was not until November 1958 that the School of Library Service was officially approved by the University of California Regents.¹ Regent Edward Augustus Dickson, who was arguably the most influential figure in the founding of UCLA, had envisioned that UCLA would have all the professional schools. A professional school of library education, which he liked to call “The School of the Library,” was one of his most adamant pursuits. That Dickson would pass unexpectedly just two years prior to Regent approval of UCLA’s School of Library Service is one of the saddest unknown tragedies of UCLA.

The decades-long history of library education at UCLA from idea to inception is integral to understanding the school’s importance in Southern California library education history. Although the school’s most visceral critics—who chose to make themselves known only after its approval—presented arguments which completely ignored the legacy leading up to the SLS’s founding, this thesis should serve as the final rebuttal to their arguments by showing that not only were their criticisms unwarranted when they made them, time has also disproved their erroneous predictions.

¹ “Regents Approve Giant UC Budget,” Daily Bruin (Los Angeles, CA), November 25, 1958, 1 & 5.
The idea for library education at UCLA has been traced by Lawrence Clark Powell as far back as a proposition set forth by Los Angeles city librarian Everett Perry who, in 1930, had approached both UCLA and USC to see if either would relieve the duties of running the Los Angeles Public Library’s librarian training school.\(^2\) The LAPL had been established in 1872. In 1891, Los Angeles’ sixth city librarian and former newspaper woman, Tessa Kelso--described as a tough, distinctive and unconventional woman--established the LAPL’s first systematic training program for library employees.\(^3\) Kelso’s successor, Mary Jones, further helped to develop the training program’s courses and encouraged LAPL staff to enroll.\(^4\) Despite a month-long investigation of Jones’ largely-contested dismissal, the decision to replace Jones with Charles Lummis, was upheld by the Los Angeles city council--a decision which Susan B. Anthony predicted in saying “of course the man will win, because there's only men to settle it.”\(^5\) \(^6\) Charles Lummis was a character of the old west. He was the first City Editor of the \emph{Los Angeles Times}, a writer, historian and Indian rights activist. He had had a number of unique experiences such as walking 143 days to Los Angeles from Cincinnati and surviving being shot by an assassin in the

---

\(^2\) Lawrence Clark Powell, Andrew Horn, and Norman Handelsman. 1963. \emph{The UCLA Library School}. Oral History Collection, Dept. of Special Collections, University Library, University of California, Los Angeles. [Los Angeles]: Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles.


\(^5\) “Famous Suffragists Address the Club Women,” Los Angeles Times, July 29, 1905.

School of Library Service founding Dean Lawrence Clark Powell would later name Lummis as one of the SLS’s “patron saints” along with Sydney B. Mitchell, the Founding Dean of the school of librarianship at University of California, Berkeley, and James L. Gillis, the California State Librarian from 1899 until 1917. Lummis contributed to the LAPL training school program by setting higher admission and entrance examination standards for applicants. Five years after his appointment, he was succeeded by Everett Perry.

Everett Perry was born in Massachusetts in 1876 and educated at both Harvard and the New York State Library School, in Albany. Perry held a life-long ambition of one day directing a major library and when traveled to Pasadena to attend the ALA convention in 1911, he successfully interviewed for the position of LAPL library director. Shortly after his appointment at the LAPL, Perry, too, raised the difficulty of the entrance exam for the LAPL training school. He also set a maximum age of thirty, and encouraged completion of college prior to applying. Perry appointed Helen Kennedy, graduate of University of Illinois Library School and former instructor at the Wisconsin Library School, as principal of the LAPL’s training school. When Kennedy was promoted to the head of Los Angeles’ branch libraries she was succeed at the LAPL school by Theodora Brewitt, also a graduate of Wisconsin and former librarian from Long Beach Public Library.

---


9 Philosophy of UCLA Library School. 1954-1956. Box 19, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Administrative files (University Archives Record Series 408). UCLA Library Special Collections, University Archives.

In 1913, Brewitt lengthened courses and added classes in current events, book selection, trade bibliography, library history, and library binding. By 1914, the LAPL school’s program duration was eleven months, included a formal internship program, and no longer required a commitment to work at the LAPL upon completion of the program. LAPL’s training class system had been officially organized into a professional library school supported by public library funds. Also in 1914, the LAPL, which had been previously housed in rented downtown buildings, moved into a new building at Grand and 5th Street. This building at Grand and 5th had previously been occupied by the California State Normal School’s Southern Branch, which had moved to a new campus on Vermont Avenue. As of 2017, this is now the site of Los Angeles City College.

The California State Normal School, which later became San Jose State University, had been founded in 1862 as a school for teachers, and in 1881, Los Angeles residents--of which there were roughly 12,000--successfully lobbied for the California State Legislature to authorize its Southern Branch. The Southern Branch of the California State Normal School opened in 1882, and in 1887 became known as the Los Angeles State Normal School. In 1917, Ernest Carroll Moore was recruited from Harvard to serve as the President of the Los Angeles State Normal School. Moore has been described as a kindly, unassuming, and old-fashioned man, with a passion for learning. He loved to read and collect books, especially the classics, philosophy, education, and history, and held a foundational philosophy that “Education is learning to use the

---


tools which the race has found indispensable.” Moore also had a plan to petition the University of California to consider operating a teacher’s college through the Normal School. Moore was regarded as an educator and belonging to the “Dewey philosophy of education,” and University of California Regent Edward Augustus Dickson, admiring Columbia and what that university had become, wanted to see what Moore thought about the idea of making a major university and not just a school of education.

Shortly after his appointment in 1917, Moore met with Dickson, the only Southern California member of the University of California Board of Regents. Dickson had been appointed to the Board of Regents in 1913, by Governor Hiram Johnson, whose election Dickson had helped to secure. Johnson had been elected in 1910 as member of the Lincoln–Roosevelt League, a group founded by Dickson, who was the editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Evening Express, and fellow newspaperman Charles Rowell. Dickson and Rowell had used their newspapers to promote a favorable image of Johnson. Upon being elected, Johnson said to Dickson, “Dick you can have anything you want. What do you want? Railroad commissioner?” Dickson said “I’d like to be Regent,” so we has appointed Regent, and so overjoyed by the appointment, that he came to tell his wife with tears in his eyes. Dickson, who was the youngest regent in UC history at age thirty-three, had his own plan of eventually opening a great University in Los Angeles as part of the UC system and enthusiastically supported Moore’s plan, despite the fact that Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President of the University of California from 1899

---

14 Ibid, 3.


16 Ibid.
to 1919, as well as Regent Rowell, were both rather opposed to the idea of a southern campus. Dickson attributes his position as editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Evening Express, a newspaper which he would later go on to own, as largely influential in promoting public opinion in favor of the creation of a “University in the Southland.” Fortunately David Prescott Barrows, the new President of the University of California in 1919, did not share his predecessor Wheeler's objections and on May 23, 1919, Governor William D. Stephens signed Assembly Bill 626 into law, which transformed the Los Angeles Normal School into the Southern Branch of the University of California.

Developing simultaneously but as a separate entity, the Los Angeles Public Library School had been admitted into the Association of American Library School in 1918, promoting itself as California’s only accredited program. Marion Horton succeeded Brewitt as its principal and the LAPL school began a program which allowed graduates to take their fifth year in training school and at the same time to receive their teachers' certificate. In 1921 the Los Angeles Public Library School was recognized in the Williamson Report, an extensive study conducted by Charles Williamson, Director of Information Service of the Rockefeller Foundation, and prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the purpose of providing the Carnegie trustees with an accurate assessment of library education in the United States. When Williamson conducted his study, he had visited the fifteen schools across the nation between the months of December 1920 and May 1921, and met with all the library

---


20 The Stanford Daily, April 24, 1919, volume 55 issue 41.

directors. His research is presented in two parts, *Training for Library Work* from 1921 and *Training for Library Service* from 1923. Of the fifteen Schools presented in the *Williamson Report*, three were located in California: LAPL, the Riverside Library Service School in Riverside, and the University of California in Berkeley, which offered courses in library service.

The Riverside Library Service School began when Joseph Francis Daniels became Riverside library director in 1910. Shortly after his appointment, Daniels, his staff, as well as a few students, began a study of their daily work within the library so that they could improve service and better inform the library’s policies and mission. The study evolved into the Riverside Library Service School which Daniels founded in 1911, and by 1913 the school was offering courses in both summer and winter. The courses were taught by reputable faculty, the expenses of which were offset by student fees. In October 1921, just months after Williamson and Daniels met, and shortly before the first Williamson report was completed, Daniels died unexpected from a paralytic stroke, and this event changed Williamson’s support for the Riverside Library Service School.22 23

Williamson had been so “captivated” by Daniels that even though he believed that “the training for librarians like the training of teachers is a state rather than a city function,” and that “library schools conducted by public libraries should be regarded as temporary expedients,” Williamson was willing make an “exception to sound policy,” since he believed Daniels to be a man of “inspiration and genius” who had genuine affection for his community.24 Although Daniel’s approach encompassed not much more than an apprenticeship-styled “learn-by doing” approach, Williamson believed that “a year spent in that environment, no matter what the


character of the formal instruction, would be excellent preparation for service in small town and rural libraries.”  

Without Daniels, however, Williamson could only conclude that the Riverside Library Service School should be “given up” and that California State library interests should focus on the two “strategically located” schools at Los Angeles and Berkeley.

Library education at UC Berkeley had begun when Melvil Dewey, of Dewey Decimal fame and the founder of the New York State Library School, wrote to the University of California president Benjamin Ide Wheeler in 1901 to suggest that he consider the opportunities for library education on the West Coast. The University of California, which had opened in Berkeley as the College of California in 1869, had begun offering summer courses in librarianship in 1902. Despite the opening of the California State Library School in Sacramento in 1914, the University of California continued to offer summer courses in librarianship until 1918. After his graduation from McGill University, Sydney Bancroft Mitchell had been working at Stanford as an order librarian where he met and became friends with colleague Edith Margaret Coulter, who had graduated from both Stanford and the New York State Library School. Coulter then transferred to the University of California’s reference department, eventually becoming that department’s head, and it was she who recommended Mitchell to fill Harold Leupp’s position in Accessions and as Assistant Librarian after Leupp was promoted to University Librarian in 1918. An emergency course in library training was initiated by Mitchell

---


26 Ibid, 212.


29 Ibid.
and quickly developed into a School of Librarianship which soon achieved national prominence. In 1922 Mitchell gave up his work as head of the Accessions Department and became Associate Librarian and lecturer in library science. In 1921, the State Library School closed and the duties were turned over to the University of California. The Department of Librarianship was approved for the College of Letters and Science in 1921 and courses began in 1922.

Despite the desirable location and prominent instructors of UC Berkeley’s library school, Williamson still reported that the Los Angeles Public Library School had strongest library program in California and the best location. Given the LAPL School’s proximity to the new Southern Branch University of California, Williamson proposed that: “there is just now a splendid opportunity to put the State School on its feet and bring it into cooperative relations with the Los Angeles School [...] aid from the Carnegie Corporation that would result in proper support of a university library school by the great State of California would go far toward stimulating and guiding development in other states.” According to Williamson, the value of this example could be increased by bringing the Los Angeles Public Library School under the state school. “Since the University of California already had a Southern Branch in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Public Library would probably be glad to turn over its school to the university, if its proper support and administration were assured.” Herein is an example of how the idea for a library school at UCLA can arguably be traced as far back as 1921. The reason Lawrence Powell could only trace the origin of the idea for library education at UCLA back as far as 1930, was because the Williamson Report of 1921, Training for Library Work, had not been published.

---

30 Ibid.

31 Williamson, Training for Library Work, 212.


33 Ibid, 213.
until 1971 when it was reproduced from a typewritten copy Charles Williamson had shared with librarian Sarah K. Vann, and it was only 1961 when Powell had given his interview in which he traces the origins back to 1930, meaning that Powell had probably not yet had the opportunity to read a copy of the unpublished 1921 *Training for Library Work.*

When the Southern Branch of the University of California had opened in 1919 there were only 250 students enrolled in courses through the College of Letters and Science. By 1920, there were 910 students, and by 1921 there were 1479. Added to the teachers’ college, the total in 1921 was 3050. In February 1922, at a meeting of the Regents, a four-year curriculum in the teacher’s college at the Southern Branch of the University of California on Vermont Avenue gained the support of Regents Cochran, Sartori, and Haynes, and when the establishment of a third year curriculum in the College of Letters and Science at the Southern Branch of the University of California was put to a vote, it passed by only one vote on February 13, 1923. The Southern Branch’s first commencement took place in June 1923 at which time twenty-six students received their Bachelor’s in Education. On December 10, 1923, the Regents finally approved a fourth senior year for the College of Letters and Science and the University of California Southern Branch was now a full-fledged four-year university.

As the University continued to grow a new site was scouted by Regent Dickson and Irwin J. Muma, who was a prominent Los Angeles business director and president and organizer of the Los Angeles Rotary Club. Dickson and Muma’s scouting expeditions led to their taking a stroll

---


35 Dickson, *University of California at Los Angeles*, 28.

36 Ibid, 28-38.

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid.
through a piece of property with rolling hills near Bel Air. Dickson, who had survived a severely life-threatening pneumonia in 1921, describes having stood in the middle of this empty field in Westwood in 1923 surrounded by the Bel Air hills and being stuck by how the landscape was quite reminiscent of the land on which UC Berkeley had been built.\footnote{Wutkee, “The Godfather of UCLA,” Interview with Wilhelmina Dickson, November 9, 1966. 400.}

Dickson himself was a graduate of Berkeley, completing his Bachelor of Laws degree in 1910. He almost completed a Master’s degree in economics there too, had his thesis not sank in the ocean. Dickson had been working to complete his thesis while teaching English in Japan, but had left Japan early because he did not like living there.\footnote{Ibid. 402.} As he was leaving he noticed a sampan sinking off the side of his boat, the very sampan which contained his all luggage, including his thesis manuscript. As it sank, he said to himself, “There it goes, I’m going to be a newspaper man,” and went on to work at the Sacramento Union, the San Francisco Chronicle, and eventually became the editor, publisher, and owner of the Los Angeles Evening Express.\footnote{Unsigned and undated postcard. Box 1. Edward A. Dickson Papers (Collection 662). Department of Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles.}

The field in which Dickson stood was part of an area known as Wolfskill Rancho, named after famous pioneer John Wolfskill, who along with his brother William, had established the development of California’s agricultural industries. Wolfskill Ranch had come to be owned by Arthur Letts, a prominent Los Angeles merchant, with whom Dickson met, and who showed immediate interest in Dickson’s university plans.\footnote{Ibid.} Letts unfortunately passed shortly after their meeting and the charge of the estate was given to developers Harold and Edwin Janss, who were

\footnote{Dickson Papers, Box 11.}

\footnote{Dickson, University of California at Los Angeles, 41-43.}
also supportive of Dickson’s vision and who offered him 200 acres for the development of the university. Despite there being sixteen other sites available for the university's new home, when the Janss brothers increased their offer to 383 acres, the Board of Regents accepted the deeds of the property on February 16, 1926.  

By 1926, the Vermont Avenue campus library was getting ready for the big move to the Westwood campus (also known as the Beverly campus). John E. Goodwin would oversee this relocation. Goodwin had, in 1923, had replaced the first librarian at Southern Branch’s University library, Elizabeth Fargo. Elizabeth Fargo became librarian in 1903 when she replaced Harriett E. Dunn, the State Normal School at Los Angeles's first librarian who had previously been a grammar and history instructor at the school since 1884. When the Southern Branch had moved to Vermont Avenue under Elizabeth Fargo, the library had approximately 25,000 books, and by the time of the move to Westwood under John Goodwin, the library had over 75,000 volumes.  

Also in 1926, Berkeley's departmental program for librarianship became a separate graduate School of Librarianship and its Dean, Sydney Mitchell, and the new Southern Branch librarian John Goodwin, who had been roommates together while at Stanford together, worked out a mutually-beneficial arrangement in which Goodwin would recruit librarians for Berkeley's library School and Mitchell would recruit Berkeley BLS grads for the Southern Branch library staff. The Regents would official change the name of the Southern Branch to University of California at Los Angeles in 1927, and the University of California at Los Angeles would be formally dedicated on March 28, 1930.

Chapter 2: The 1930s, Great Depression, Powell and Horn first come to UCLA

By the time of the Great Depression, the resources of the Los Angeles Public Library had become strained. Although the LAPL experienced a 60-percent increase in demand for books, from 1929 to 1933, it also experienced a 24-percent drop in per-capita tax receipts and the library’s resources.\(^{49}\) This spike in usership could be attributed to the rapid population growth in California; from 1920 to 1930, the population of California had grown 65.7 percent.\(^{50}\) Los Angeles City Librarian Everett R. Perry attributed the LAPL’s growth in patronage to the increased need to ascertain facts and discover inspiration and ways in which to spend leisure time profitably.\(^{51}\) The financial situation was so dire that Perry proposed to President Sproul and Regent Dickson the establishment of a library school on the Los Angeles campus of the University of California, mentioning that his library board concurred in the position taken by the American Library Association which, in line with the sentiments of Charles Williamson in the Williamson report, favored the professional training of librarians in universities rather than in libraries. Although Edward Dickson was largely in favor of the idea for library education at the Southern Branch, President Sproul, who was himself a USC graduate, was opposed.\(^{52}\)

Regent Edward Dickson—who in 1931 had left newspaper work to become President of the Western Federal Savings and Loan—put pressure on Goodwin to try to convince president Sproul of the benefits of library education at UCLA, but Goodwin would have none of it because having a school of library education at UCLA would mean that he would no longer be able to


\(^{50}\) Ibid.

\(^{51}\) Ibid.

\(^{52}\) Powell and Handelsman, “The UCLA Library School,” 1-4.
benefit from his mutually-beneficial arrangement with Mitchell. Library education in Northern California had already been made more competitive since San Jose State College, which had originally been founded as the first Normal School in San Francisco in 1857, had begun offering courses in librarianship in 1928, which by 1930, had evolved into a full training program.53

Although the Los Angeles Library School had successfully trained more than 400 librarians, much to Perry’s dismay, it was discontinued in 1932. Perry pleaded for either the University of California at Los Angeles or the University of Southern California to relieve the duties of running the library school from the LALP, but to no avail. When Dean Sydney Mitchell had received an urgent call from the 1932 California Library Association convention in Santa Barbara to inform him that there was a growing movement to recommend the establishment of a new library school, and that there was much talk of UCLA being the idea location, Mitchell immediately hurried to Santa Barbara and “succeeded in checking that threat.”54 In 1933, even though no longer providing the library school, the LAPL still had to further reduced its hours despite a growing demand for service.55 Sadly Everett Perry died of a heart ailment on October 30, 1933.

The 1930s marked a time of significant expansion of the UCLA library including large donations from Danish historian Kristian Erslev as well as professors Axel Koch, Friedrich Kluge, Verner Dahlerup, Otto Bremer, and Konrad Burdach which added over 20,000 volumes in the subject areas of Northern European studies, especial Germanic and Scandinavian philology.56 In 1926, William Andrews Clark Jr. had announced his gift of the Clark Library to


55 “Depression Boon to Library,” Los Angeles Times.

56 Vosper, Books at UCLA, 6-7.
UCLA as a memorial of his father, and in 1934 the title passed to the Regents, at which time it was revealed that Clark has left a further bequest of an adequate endowment. In 1936, the Regents purchased the Robert Ernest Cowan collection, who was the bibliographer to William Andrew Clark collection of 8,000 rare volumes including books, pamphlets and maps, and materials relating to early history of California. In 1938, when UCLA and Berkeley jointly purchased the Burdach and Bremer collection, it marked an early cooperative buying venture between the two schools which was handled “with much wisdom and goodwill.” In the 1930s, Berkeley’s library education program also continued to thrive. In 1933, under new accreditation standards, the American Library Association named Berkeley one of only five “Type I” designated schools due to its graduate degree offerings, and in 1937 the school received an endowment grant of $150,000 from the Carnegie Corporation. The glimmers of library education at UCLA were also apparent in the 1930s. In 1935, with the support of its rapidly growing library and in cooperation with Berkeley, UCLA began offering a summer source in librarianship as part of the “first wave of post-Depression expansion” of library schools in the United States.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 Ibid.


After the closure of the LAPL school, summer sessions held at the University of Southern California from 1933-1936 met the need for library training in the region. USC had been founded in 1880 as the first private research university in California. After four years of pressure from the Alumni Association of the Public Library for a graduate library school at the University of Southern California, the resources of the defunct Los Angeles Public Library school were transferred there and the School of Library Service at USC was inaugurated in September 1936. The School of Library Service at USC first opened under temporary director Andrea D. Osborne in 1936. In 1937, the name was changed to School of Library Science and was operated from 1937 to 1946 under the directorship of Mary Duncan Carter. Carter held a baccalaureate in library science from the New York Library School at Albany and a doctorate from the University of Chicago. She had been a teacher of library science at McGill University and the University of Southern California, prior to becoming Director of the Library School at USC. USC’s library school was accredited by the Board of Education for Librarianship of the American Library Association in 1938 for its two year program in which a Bachelor of Science in Library Science was granted at the end of the first year, and a Master of Science in Library Science degree award at the end of the second.

During the late 1930s, a couple of other important individuals appeared in the library landscape of Southern California. Around the time of 1937-38, Lawrence Clark Powell, a young man who was a family friend of Edward Dickson, had graduated from the BLS program at

---


65 University of Southern California School of Library Science records 1892-1986. USC Libraries Special Collections University of Southern California. University Archives.
Berkeley and took a job as a bibliographical checker at the UCLA library. Edward Dickson had been friends with Lawrence’s father George Powell. George Harold Powell worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a pomologist in the Bureau of Plant Industry, studying fruit storage and transportation, and had first travelled to California in 1904 to study the problem of citrus fruits rotting in transit. Lawrence Powell was born while his father was working in Washington DC in 1906. Dickson would later tell Powell that when he and his wife Wilhelmina visited the capital, such as when Dickson took a position as assistant to senator John Works in 1910, George Powell would provide the Edward Dickson and his wife Wilhelmina with chilled California Orange juice every morning. Powell's family returned to South Pasadena, California when he was five years old, and Powell would go on to graduate from South Pasadena High School and to receive a B.A. from Occidental College in 1928 and completing his doctorate from the University of Burgundy in Dijon in 1932.

Lawrence Clark Powell’s liked modern art, jazz, sports cars, and Mozart. In some ways Powell was very opposite Edward Dickson, who much preferred quiet to any type of music and strongly disliked certain types of Modern art. One of the most differing aspects in particular of Dickson and Powell’s personalities was in their politics. Dickson was an active progressive and

---


69 *Origins*, 1-5.


72 Wutkee, “The Godfather of UCLA.”
Republican who had founded the Lincoln-Roosevelt League, who used his influence as a
newspaperman to help elect Hiram Johnson in 1911, and who, in 1932, served on the Republican
State Central Committee and California Delegation. Contrastingly, in 1934, Lawrence Clark
Powell--who would have been about twenty-seven or twenty-eight--had registered as a
Communist.73 Powell describes having done so in protest of the social inequities which had
become apparent to him during the Great Depression. The CPUSA was a growing movement in
the 1930s. In 1930, it had 7,545 members; in 1934 that number grew to 23,760, and by 1938,
membership was approximately 75,000.74

Despite their differences, Dickson and Powell shared significant similarities, most
notably a love of books and learning. Prior to working at UCLA, Powell had worked as a
shipping clerk at local rare bookstores until Los Angeles City Librarian Althea Hester Warren, in
Powell's words, “plucked me out of Jake Zeitlin's bookshop and sent me off to Berkeley,
completing a Certificate of Librarianship from UC Berkeley in 1937.”75 Powell later returned to
Los Angeles to work for Warren at the Central Library in downtown Los Angeles, after which he
returned to the UCLA library to work in acquisitions. By the early 1940s, Goodwin had changed
the library classification from Dewey Decimal to Library of Congress, he had also opposed and
eventually defeated a proposal to make the library at Los Angeles an adjunct collection of a main
research library at UC Berkeley, and had taken the library from 39,000 to close to 400,000
volumes. In order to reward Powell for his good work, Goodwin allowed him to select the UCLA

74 Victor G. Devinatz, Encyclopedia Britannica, “Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA)”
75 Myrna Oliver, "Lawrence Clark Powell; Lifted UCLA Library to Prominence." Los Angeles Times, March

Also in 1937, another important figure in the history of library education at UCLA, a young man named Andrew Harlis Horn, graduated from UCLA with his BA in History. Andrew Horn had been born in Ogden, Utah in 1914. Horn’s father was a Union Pacific railroad engineer and his mother was a self-taught stenographer, known for having recorded the Scopes trial. The Horns moved to California when Andrew was a teenager. He graduated from Venice High School in 1932, completed an AA degree at Santa Monica Junior College in 1935, a BA degree in history at UCLA in 1937, and a Master’s degree in History and Economics in February of 1940, also at UCLA. Although he had initially studied Latin American history, Professor David K. Bjork encouraged Horn to study European history. He graduated again from UCLA with his Ph.D. in Medieval History and Economics in 1943. While a student at UCLA, Horn worked as a research assistant, teaching assistant and lecturer. From 1942 to 1943, Andrew Horn also worked for Douglas Aircraft Company writing technical manuals. Horn joined the U.S. Army in November 1943, and was soon assigned to the Educational Reconditioning Branch of the Medical Department, where he planned programs, taught courses and provided counseling to soldiers. UCLA, however, had not seen the last of Andrew Horn.78

77 Ibid.
78 Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Biographical files of Andrew Harlis Horn. (University Archives Record Series 454). UCLA Library Special Collections, University Archives.
Chapter 3: The 1940s: Powell Succeeds Goodwin and Dickson Keeps Pushing for his “School of the Library”

In 1943, the Riverside Library Service School had closed, making the only three programs for library education in California the University of California’s School of Librarianship at Berkeley, the School of Library Science at the University of Southern California, and the Department of Librarianship at San Jose State College. Williamson’s recommendation that library education should occur within the university setting had come to actualization in California. Although Berkeley’s summer program on the Los Angeles campus was suspended temporarily in 1942 following the entry of the United States into World War II, it was resumed after the war. In 1944, UCLA’s only professional school was Education, yet Edward Dickson would routinely try to persuade Goodwin to consider a “School of the Library,” as he liked to call it. Powell observed this and asked himself why, within a university that had only one professional school and a library that barely held 400,000 volumes, did a school of library education mean so much to Dickson?

Dickson, like Powell, was very much a man of books. He would often bring Powell unusual and rare books to be put on the library shelves. Dickson had a personal library in his home and Ann Sumner, a close family friend of the Dicksons who had been a junior writer for the Los Angeles Evening Express, recalls being entranced by his reading habits, how he would sit in his library in the evening with his wife, on a blue sofa, plowing through the encyclopedia to

79 Powell, The UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1-10.
80 Ibid.
answer questions he had stored up during the day.\textsuperscript{82} Dickson had also become a member of the Los Angeles Board of Library Commissioners in 1948. He sat on the board for many years next to Dr. Rufus von KleinSmid, president of USC, during which time he saw many USC graduates filling Southern California library positions. Powell speculated that this bothered Dickson, who would have liked to see UCLA graduates “get some of the gravy.”\textsuperscript{83} Dickson, however, was not the kind of man to be motivated by rivalry or self-promotion. According to Harold Hamill, who had become LAPL Librarian in 1947, “From the day of his appointment, the Library staff was aware of Mr. Dickson's keen intellect and sincere interest. He did not take his responsibilities lightly, and followed each item brought before the Board with close attention. There was only one way to persuade Mr. Dickson of the value of any proposition under consideration, and that was solely on its own merits. He could not be appealed to except in terms of public interest.”\textsuperscript{84}

In 1944 Powell also became Director of the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library as well as University Librarian at UCLA upon Goodwin’s retirement, at which time Ernest Moore said to him, “Mr. Goodwin was the first Librarian of UCLA. He was the shaper of the Library. You are in his footsteps. The undertaking, as you know, is both vast and responsible. The part which the Library must do will never be completely done. It gratifies us to see it growing into great power.”\textsuperscript{85} Thus the Mitchell-Goodwin arrangement came to an end. Upon Powell’s new appointment as University Librarian at UCLA, one of his first callers was Edward Dickson, who would regularly visit, often bringing with him rare and valuable books for Powell to put on the open stacks, and Dickson would ask Powell just when he was going to open that “School of the
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In February 1946, Governor Warren had signed Assembly Bill 35 along with a $7 million provision for a medical school at UCLA, and Dickson was determined that UCLA should have all the professional schools. Powell, however, did not think UCLA was ready for a library school, and would not be fully convinced of UCLA’s ability to support such a school until 1951. In the meantime, Powell would have to “divert” Dickson by reassuring him that UCLA was indeed destined to have all the professional schools. Powell first wanted to reorganize, extend and develop the UCLA library and branch system. Dickson agreed to wait, but according to Powell, every year thereafter he would continue to come by Powell’s office to keep asking just when he was going to open the school. If Powell claimed he needed to get the budget, Dickson would say that was “nonsense” and that all Powell needed was to found the school and that Dickson would help find the money. Powell quotes Dickson as saying to him, “You can have classes out here on the lawn. I’ll bring the benches. It doesn’t matter, facilities or not. The idea comes first.”

In 1947, Powell created a department of Special Collections at UCLA to house rare and valuable material. Also in 1947, after working at John Hopkins University for a year teaching classes on the History of Western Civilization, Andrew Horn returned to work at UCLA as a senior Library Assistant. Horn left briefly to complete his BLS from Berkeley in 1948 and returned again to UCLA that year to become the Assistant Head of the UCLA Library’s Department of
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Special Collections, working under the Department Head, Neal Harlow, who acted as a mentor to Andrew Horn.

The 1948 report *A Report of a Survey of Needs of California in Higher Education* by the Legislative Interim Committee on the Survey of Higher Education found that “The graduate library schools of the University of California and the University of Southern California have the facilities to supply the entire needs of the State for library personnel trained at this level; the problem in California is not one of a shortage of training facilities but rather one of providing salary scales for library service that will attract sufficient personnel to use the training facilities fully. Under present conditions libraries employ teacher-librarians trained at San Jose who are not prepared at the graduate level or for public library service. It is expected that the University of California and the library profession of the State will take leadership in endeavoring to raise levels of compensation in order that training may be brought to the standard that prevails where the finest type of public library service is provided.”  

90 In response to the report, a pre-librarianship curriculum was developed at UCLA, not to offer undergraduate courses in librarianship, but to counsel students on preparation for admission to graduate library schools elsewhere.  
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Chapter 4: The Loyalty Oath Controversy Comes Between Powell and Dickson, but then Brings Them Closer Together

Beginning around 1946, the Southern Regents began to favor the decentralization and reorganization of the university system to allow for more autonomy at UCLA. There were often long delays and cumbersome procedures and even occasions when UCLA had to lobby in Sacramento against the university. The Southern Regents even had secret study made by a consulting group in Chicago favoring decentralization, but, as the plan would diminish power from the north, Sproul was opposed to it. The Southern Regents gained an ally when John Francis Neylan, a regent from the north, joined in opposition of Sproul. The division between Sproul and the Southern Regents continued to escalate even after Edward Dickson succeed James Moffitt to become Chairman of the Board of Regents in 1948.

On March 25, 1949, after California State Senator Tenney had introduced a series of bills to address the growing concerns regarding suspected communists in government, Sproul proposed that UC employees, including faculty, be required to swear to a new Oath stating that they are not members of the Communist party. Despite the prior rivalry between Sproul and the Regents in regards to decentralization of the University and recommendation for revisions from the Northern Section of the Academic Senate, the UC Regents supported Sproul’s proposal, and the Oath was revised and approved. Despite widespread faculty opposition to the Oath, President
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Sproul issued an October 1st, 1949 deadline by which each member of the UC faculty must return a signed copy of the Oath. That November, “non-signers” of the Oath formally organized in protest at Berkeley, yet this did not derail the Regents one bit.\textsuperscript{96} In December the Regents fired a UC Berkeley Physics Teaching Assistant, Irving David Fox after Fox was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) on suspicion of security breaches at the Radiation Laboratory during which time Fox admitted having attended communist meetings in the past. The House Un-American Activities Committee had been established in 1938 as a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives to investigate allegations of communist activity in the United States, during the early years of the Cold War. Regent Edward Dickson was largely in favor of HUAC. According to Dickson’s nephew Edward Hawkins Dickson, “He was a great supporter of Joe McCarthy, and he was all for these Un-American Activities investigations.”\textsuperscript{97}

On February 24, 1950, the Regents voted 12-6 that faculty that had not signed the Oath by April 30th must be terminated by June 30th. One hundred and fifty UC faculty members met at Berkeley to again protest, and publicly refuse the sign the Oath.\textsuperscript{98} Upon realizing just how big of a controversy the issue had become and its possible legal implications, President Sproul began to reconsider whether or not the Oath was a good idea in the first place. Sproul’s rival John Francis Neylan had initially opposed the Oath when Sproul first proposed it, but when Neylan became aware that Sproul was withdrawing his support, he took the opportunity to try to undermine Sproul’s leadership abilities by leading the Regents to favor of the Oath, which put Sproul in the difficult position of having to come out against the very thing which himself had proposed. Since Sproul was largely “immobilized” by his difficult position, California Governor
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Earl Warren, in an unconventional role for a State governor, led Regental opposition to the Oath and was especially opposed to the firing of non-signers.99

On March 6th, 1950, eight thousand students met to discuss the Oath and the very next day, seven-hundred and fifty faculty members protested at Northern Section of the Academic Senate. On March 31, 1950, the Regents met to discuss the Oath, but ended up spending the meeting debating who controls the university.100 The Regents in favor of the Oath, led by Neylan, felt that if they did not uphold their stance that it would compromise their governing authority. The Regents voted ten-to-ten on a motion to withdraw the ultimatum to sign the Oath, but since it was tie, the ultimatum remained.101 In June of 1950, President Sproul requested that 157 employees be terminated for not signing the Oath, or for issues regarding the signing of the Oath, however he also recommended 62 of the 75 non-signers be retained. In July of 1950, the Regents voted ten-to-nine to support President Sproul’s recommendations and retain the majority of the non-signing faculty, which now numbered only 39.102 This decision was quickly reversed, however, on August 25, 1950, when the Regents met again to vote 12-10 to reverse their July decision and fire the non-signers. Although some non-signers ended up signing after the vote, a total of 31 faculty were actually fired, including UCLA history Professor John Caughey who actually called Regent Dickson at his home to engage with him in “heated telephone conversations” which turned into “bitter four hour shouting match[es],” which even Dickson’s wife Wilhelmina said were “pretty hectic.”103
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On August 31, 1950, the non-signers sued for reinstatement in the case of *Tolman v. Underhill*. Professor Edward Chace Tolman had been a vocal leader of the resistance of the oath and after the Regents sought his dismissal, he sued the Regents; Robert M. Underhill was the Regents’ secretary and treasurer. In September of 1950, since California Governor Earl Warren was up for reelection, he realized he needed to promote an image of himself being tough on Communism, so despite his initial opposition, Warren asked the Legislature to approve a special loyalty oath for all State employees. The Legislature passed the “Levering Oath” which required all state employees to sign a loyalty oath disavowing any radical beliefs. Regent Neylan, who had led the Regents in favor of Sproul’s Oath, was actually strongly against the Levering Oath because he felt the Legislature should not be interfering in the autonomous governing authority of the Regents. On April 6, 1951, the Court of Appeal ruled in *Tolman v. Underhill* against the Regents, stating that they had violated a Constitutional prohibition on political influence on the University. The case was then appealed in the California Supreme Court in October of 1951 and the Regents voted 12-8 to rescind the Oath requirement, but still upheld the UC policy against employing Communists. An effort by Regent Neylan to reverse the decision failed 12-5 in November of 1951. Although Sproul’s Oath was rescinded, UC employees still had to sign the Levering Oath, which would now be required of all State employees, until it too was deemed unconstitutional in 1967.

On November 27, 1951, the State Senate Interim Committee on Education, called Lawrence Clark Powell to testify in a two-day hearing investigating un-American activity in
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education. Powell was being investigated in regards to exhibits in the Library reference room, especially one in particular called “Threats to the Schools,” which contained books and pamphlets that discussed the problems facing public education. Senator Nelson Dilworth accused the exhibit of discouraging prospective teachers, whereas Powell believed it would stimulate discussion and allow student teachers to more fairly consider professional issues.

During the hearing, the committee brought up the fact that back in 1934 Powell had registered as a Communist. Although Powell freely admitted his registration, explaining his actions in that it was a social protest and he was young, the media took the opportunity to sensationalize the admission. Also during in the hearing, Serrill Gerber, the president of the Los Angeles Federation of Teachers, questioned the Oath, believing that it should not be enforced since it would essentially be ineffective, since signers could lie and that it would cause greater damage by discouraging potential teachers from entering the field. This debate was one also had by Regent Dickson and his nephew Edward Hawkins Dickson. Edward Hawkins Dickson argued that “a Communist doesn't give a damn whether he takes an oath or not, Communists will lie all the time,” to which his namesake uncle would respond, “Well it’s alright, because then you could catch them for perjury.”

Dickson had called Powell at home to let him know that he was going to take out a full page advertisement in the Los Angeles Times in support of the Regents and to let him know that he would like to include Powell’s name as supporting the Regents. Powell felt a tremendous
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amount of political pressure because he felt as though it had been implied to him by Dickson that Powell’s responsibility as an administrator of the library included Powell not taking any position which would jeopardize the library’s budget recommendations.\textsuperscript{114} Powell was very much opposed to the Oath. Powell shared his private feelings with Dickson that “We don't need a special oath; we already have an oath to support the Constitution as state employees; we don't need a special oath for the university. And I don't want to take a position in this as an administrator; I want my staff to feel that I'm not coercing them one way or the other.”\textsuperscript{115} Powell determined that he was going to sign the special Oath and include a letter to the Regents as an attachment stating that he was signing under protest because he wanted to go on record, saying “I was going to, in other words, walk the fence. But I told the staff, as I recall, that ‘you're free to do whatever you have to do in your own intellectual honesty, and I don't expect any of you to take one position or another; you're absolutely free,’ but I said, ‘Those of you who don't wish to sign the oath and won't sign it at all, I'll protect your position as long as I can. I'll attempt to keep you on the payroll by one means or another up to the last ditch; so go ahead and do what you have to do.”\textsuperscript{116}

Shortly after Powell’s Communist registration had been publicized and sensationalized, Regent Dickson visited Powell at UCLA, to meet with him in person. Dickson’s nephew Edward remembers being with his uncle at UCLA while the two men met in private at the library, “[Powell] was a great friend of Uncle Ed’s and uncle went in and had a long talk, and the fellow told him the whole story. [...] He said that the fellow told him that he wasn’t really a Communist but you know the Depression days and everything. [...] I think it was true of a lot of people [...] I
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damn near was a Communist myself. [...] Things were desperate.”\textsuperscript{117} Nephew Edward recalls this meeting as having a significant impact on his uncle, “He cried, and he came out a rather changed man after that.”\textsuperscript{118} After fully realizing the devastating effects that the Oath hysteria had on Powell, Dickson was determined to make things right. As UCLA School of Medicine founder Elmer Belt recalled, “The greatest thing Dickson did for Larry Powell was the day the newspapers came out and said Larry Powell was a Communist.”\textsuperscript{119} Dickson, who was also still the President of Western Federal Savings and Loan, invited Powell to lunch with him at the California Club where he was meeting with a group of bankers. Dickson introduced Powell as “our very valuable librarian at UCLA.”\textsuperscript{120} Then Dickson relayed to his colleagues how dismayed he was with the papers for their portrayal of Powell by saying things like “the goddamned newspapers,” and “to think I once owned that paper!”\textsuperscript{121} Dickson then took Powell with him to a meeting of the Board of Regents and where he told them “In the newspapers this week it was announced that Larry Powell is a Communist. Now he’s not a Communist and he’s my friend, and I want that to be the end of it.”\textsuperscript{122}

According to Elmer Belt in regards to Dickson’s actions against the onslaught of anti-Powell sentiment, “this man stopped it just blank, just stopped it.”\textsuperscript{123} Throughout this situation, the true extent of Edward Dickson’s loyalty and support for Lawrence Powell had been made known to many, most of all, Powell himself, and it was just about this time, in 1951, that Powell
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would also become fully convinced of UCLA’s ability to support a library school. In 1952, the State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the non-signers in *Tolman v. Underhill* and ordered the University to reinstate them at which time the Regents decided not to petition for a rehearing.¹²⁴ Through this situation the greatest differences in personality and opinion which existed between Dickson and Powell became the very thing which brought them closer together, cementing their friendship. As Powell would put it, “Dickson and I, you see, were more political, compromising types and though I didn't support him, he didn't use this against me. He was able to go and resume our friendship and we became closer and closer as the years passed.”¹²⁵

¹²⁴ *Tolman v. Underhill.*

Chapter 5: The Ball is Rolling for Library Education at UCLA

At the end of 1951, two days after Christmas, President Sproul, made a request to Robert D. Leigh, who had directed the Public Library Inquiry, a comprehensive survey of the American public library on behalf of the Social Science Research Council, to conduct a special survey to determine if there is need for an additional school of librarianship and if there is such a need, and whether or not the need could be met by UCLA. In his request to Leigh to supply the report, Sproul had recognized only UC Berkeley and the University of California as the two schools of librarianship in California because the program for professional instruction in librarianship at San Jose was only an undergraduate department rather than a library school. San Jose’s program was, however, included in Leigh’s report since it was designated by the State Department of Education as its only library teacher-training institution in California’s state colleges giving professional education for the library positions in the public schools.

Leigh conducted his report by sending multiple questionnaires to the chief librarians and libraries of all types and sizes throughout California, the list of which was provided by the California State Library as well as the Elementary School Division of the State Department of Education. The questionnaires were sent to 1328 libraries, and 986 replied. Leigh also had separate questionnaires for all those who held professional positions in the libraries which were filled-out and returned by way of the chief librarian, as well as a non-professional librarian questionnaire, which was distributed by ten of the largest libraries in the state. A questionnaire was also sent to California library school students at USC, Berkeley, and San Jose State as well as students in out-of-state library schools whose homes were in California. Students’ contact
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information had been made available to Leigh through correspondence with the, as of 1952, thirty-three ALA-accredited library schools. There were seventeen such students, sixteen of which responded to the survey. All but the chief librarians’ questionnaires were anonymous. Leigh also consulted each California library school’s records as well as personally performed an examination of the facilities and resources at UCLA. Over the course of six weeks from January to February, and then from May to June of 1952, Leigh met and interviewed over 150 librarians and library staff including Lawrence Powell. Powell felt that the population explosion in California would entail a need for at least three schools, possibly as many as six, but Powell could not convince Leigh of this outlook.128

Leigh, however, did report on the favorable opinion of his respondents toward library education at a public institution in Southern California. In presenting excerpts of the anonymous questionnaires Leigh includes one which reads, “I have met four girls who would be fine prospects for librarianship. Each had some non-professional library experience, was industrious and intelligent. Not one, in spite of her enthusiasm for library work, could afford the tuition fees of the only university library school in this area. In short, state support of a library school in Southern California would be the greatest boon to the public library since Carnegie.”129

According to Leigh, only about a third of respondents favored enlarging the existing schools rather than creating a new library school.130 Among junior college, high school, and special librarians 75% of respondents favored the school.131 A majority of chief librarians favored the new school and only two-thirds of the amount that favored the new school opposed
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Municipal librarians favored a new library school by a slight majority and county librarians were divided equally. Only University librarians had a majority which favored expansion of existing facilities.

Leigh reports that “a goodly number of comments dealt specifically with the instruction staff” and that “as for Berkeley and USC, some of the comments regarding faculty and leadership were directed at both, some at one or the other of the two schools specifically, with Berkeley receiving the major load of criticism.” This criticism included statements which Leigh received as responses to his questionnaires. One was disparaging of the program USC saying that “USC has become very weak with too much turnover on the faculty and weak direction.” Another was critical of Berkeley in writing that “the UC Library School is coasting on the momentum given it by Mr. Mitchell; it still has a reputation for excellence which cannot continue long under the present Administration.” A commenter had also noted that “now the pendulum seems to have swung to the other extreme at least at Berkeley, where theory so far dominates that it has left practical problems and professional ethics behind.” A different respondent also criticized both schools in saying “neither library school has adequate faculty, courses, or facilities nor are the heads of either school in sympathetic touch with the practicing librarians in the State.” Interestingly, Leigh notes that “there was no negative criticism of the
work being done at San Jose.”140 As of 2017, San Jose’s is the only program of these three schools which has remained in continuous operation since the Leigh report. Despite much of the feedback he received in favor of library education at UCLA, Leigh's report recommended against the establishment of the library school at UCLA because he believed that California could not support three major library schools.141 Leigh did, however, note that “needs might best be served by the transfer of the USC school to UCLA.”142 USC, however, was not going to do that.

On January 13, 1953, City Librarian Harold Hamill wrote to Regent Dickson regarding “the immediate need for a library school at the University of California in Los Angeles.”143 Harold had been appointed by the Public Library Executives Association of Southern California, made up of the executives of about seventy public libraries, to help work toward the establish of such a school. Hamill wrote to Dickson of the nation-wide shortage of trained librarians which was particularly drastic in Southern California. Despite the LAPL’s plan to increase salaries--for example, twenty years prior the salary had been $1400 a year and it was now $3,456 a year, which increased to $4260 after four full years--the trained librarian shortages, according to Hamill, were as acute as they had been in the war years.144 Hamill wrote that the library school at USC graduated about fifty trained librarians annually, but that once these librarians are divided amongst the many different types and kinds of libraries in Southern California, there was still a significant shortage. Hamill told Dickson that he believed USC’s library school was doing a good job under limited circumstances, but that there are “very definite limitations imposed by the
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conditions under which it operates.”\textsuperscript{145} Hamill gives an example of such limitation in that USC’s program did not offer night classes that would give credit toward the library science degree. Hammill suggested to Dickson that “in a very real sense we not only need more trained librarians, but we need to attract to the profession an increasing number of superior people with a capacity to be more than able technicians,” adding that “librarians in Southern California have a united hope that a library school of the strongest possible type, with full facilities and faculty, will be available soon to correct the present situations.”\textsuperscript{146}

Also in 1953, Governor Goodwin Knight, who had succeed Governor Warren after Warren resigned to become Chief Justice of the United States, was attempting to gather support for Powell’s dismissal, owing to the whole communist ordeal, and Powell quotes Dickson as having said to Knight something to the effect of “I'll have you know, sir, Dr. Powell is known to me personally and professionally, and I vouch for his antecedents and character and loyalty. Does the governor wish to say anything more on this?”\textsuperscript{147} After this confrontation, Dickson was informed by Sproul that the governor dropped the issue.\textsuperscript{148} In 1954, Powell, who was now determined to give Dickson his School of the Library, went to Columbia University to work as a visiting professor so that he could observe their classes and operations.\textsuperscript{149} After he returned, he learned that the USC school was rather “shaken up” by the possibility of a school at UCLA.\textsuperscript{150} Powell would later tell how in 1955, at a conference at Occidental on library education, Powell had been promoting his plans for library school at UCLA and suggested that the enrollment
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would not jeopardize USC, but rather, would stimulate enrollment, and that in response to this statement he heard “hollow laughter” coming from a section of USC faculty in the audience.\footnote{151}

Martha Boaz was the USC library school’s seventh Dean by the time she took over the position in 1955. Boaz knew that Powell had been working to gain library school support throughout the mid-1950s contrary to the recommendations of the Leigh Report and she was not too amicable to the idea of a library school at UCLA, stating that “I was opposed to the establishment of the school for several reasons and expressed my opinions. My major reason was that I felt that the Los Angeles area could not support two such schools, although the demand for librarians was high in the late 50s and early 60s. I also thought that many students would go to UCLA because of the low cost at a state university with practically no tuition compared to our relatively high tuition at USC, a private university.”\footnote{152} She felt that the potential competition threatened her program and she noted that “the competition between library schools is even more noticeable than that between schools within one institution.”\footnote{153} She believed that California had enough library school programs that were already accredited to fulfill the library education needs of the state. She liked the idea of a model wherein Berkeley could educate the librarians in Northern California and USC could educate those in Southern California. According to Boaz, “We had a good faculty, a good curriculum, and we were doing a ‘thriving business.’”\footnote{154} Boaz also believes that her stance against the UCLA school was not entirely biased and laments that “Despite the negative surveys and the abundance of schools, Larry Powell, tough and determined, persisted in his goal and got his school. I was concerned and worried about the

situation and talked to a number of people about it. Although I was probably prejudiced because of my association with USC I think I would have opposed the UCLA school, even had I been in a detached position. From a practical point of view and from a budget point of view, it seemed that starting a new school would be a drain on the state’s money supply and it would establish a rivalry situation that would not be healthy.”

In 1955, a restudy of the 1948 report *A Report of a Survey of Needs of California in Higher Education*, entitled *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education* devoted about three pages out of over 450 to outline the concerns regarding education for librarianship. Despite the small amount of space given to the topic, Library Education was listed along with the other important disciplines of professional education such as Architecture, Dentistry, Engineering, and Law. The Restudy Report referred to librarianship as a “slow-developing” profession. The report estimated that in 1952, there were 3,514 persons holding professional positions in California libraries and also figured that only 2,585 beginning professional positions would open between 1955 and 1965. This report, like the Leigh Report, recommended against a new library school in favor of bolstering the existing library schools, which the report recognized to be those at San Jose State College, University of California at Berkeley, and the University of Southern California, as well as a new library school at Immaculate Heart College. The restudy also recommended, much to the dismay of Powell and Dickson, that the matter of a library school at UCLA should not be reconsidered until 1960.
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Immaculate Heart College, established by the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, was founded in Los Angeles in 1906. The college was located on the same campus as a high school and middle school which the Sisters had established in 1905. According to instructor Hazel Adele Pulling, the idea for the library school at Immaculate Heart had been requested by their alumnae for many years.\(^{159}\) The Immaculate Heart administration recognized the need for more trained librarians in Southern California and in August 1951, the decision was made to establish a program in library science. Undergraduate classes began in the spring of 1953 and the State Department of Education soon approved the program.\(^{160}\) In 1955, Sister Mary Regis, who led the Immaculate Heart library education program, seeing the need for trained librarians and recognizing that Immaculate Heart was ready to begin offering Master’s degrees in library education, first met with Powell to make sure she would not be infringing on his plans for a library school.\(^{161}\) She asked him directly whether or not he was going to open a school at UCLA. Powell told her that has soon as he had the budget and the authority that he would plan to do so. Sister Regis asked him when that would be, and Powell did not have an answer. Sister Regis told Powell that if he would open one soon, that would satisfy the need, and Immaculate Heart would not need to do so, however, if UCLA was not going to open a library school, then Immaculate Heart felt they should, given they had an established program, and Southern California libraries were expressing an immediate need. Powell laments that “We couldn't get the UCLA School open in time to satisfy the Catholic Sister Librarians, so they went ahead and set up a small school themselves.”\(^{162}\) While Powell believed Immaculate Heart was a good school, he did not
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believe that Immaculate Heart had the resources to become an ALA-accredited school, even though in 1956, the Western College Association did approve their Master’s program.\footnote{Ibid.}\footnote{Pulling, “Library Training,” 112-113.}

Immaculate Heart was a Catholic institution, but their library education program was open to all, and all courses were designed to meet the needs of the individual regardless of religious affiliation. The Sisters believed that “for as sure as librarianship has a common core of techniques, materials, services, and administrative practices, so do the spiritual basis of our being have a common ground on which we all meet,” and that library science is an auxiliary discipline and therefore background knowledge and continual growth in subject knowledge and appreciation of the arts is essential.\footnote{Ibid.} The graduate program was open to both men and women, however, the undergraduate college was for women only. The college’s undergraduate program was restricted to non-professional work and all professional training was covered at the graduate level. Courses were offered in late afternoon and evening to accommodate in-service students and work-study situations. The school offered three programs of study: a Public Library Certificate program, the California State Librarianship Credential, and the Master’s in Library Science. The school enjoyed a growth from an enrollment of six in the spring of 1953 to forty-eight in autumn of 1956.\footnote{Ibid, 131.}

Despite the findings of the Restudy Report, and despite the new Library Science Master’s program at Immaculate Heart, Powell still felt increasing pressure from the field schools and public libraries to open a library training school at UCLA. Neither Dickson nor Powell much cared for findings of the Restudy Report, least of all that it had recommended delaying the matter
until 1960. To help remedy the situation, one of Powell’s library staff, Everett Moore, offered on behalf of the rest of the staff to start an “underground” seminar to work on planning the library school at UCLA.\textsuperscript{167} Moore, an avid member of the American Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee and an officer of the Freedom to Read Foundation, had attended Occidental as a student with Powell.\textsuperscript{168} After completing a Master’s in English at Harvard in 1933 and a certificate in librarianship from UC Berkeley in 1939, Moore began working as a reference librarian at Berkeley and the University of Illinois until the United States’ involvement in World War II, at watch time he worked as an Education Officer in the South Pacific. Moore join the UCLA Library staff in 1946 where he worked as the head of the Reference Department.\textsuperscript{169}

To avoid violating the mandate from the Regents that the issue of library school not be addressed until 1960, Powell, Moore, and approximately twenty other individuals would convene in secret after work from six-to-nine in the evening once-a-week on their personal time.\textsuperscript{170} During these secret meetings, they would bring a “bag supper” over which they would blueprint and plan the potential library school. Powell describes what became known as “The Library Education Seminar,” as a “wonderful underground movement.”\textsuperscript{171} Also as a way of avoiding the Regent’s mandate, Powell drove all around Southern California to meet with librarians in coffee shops on his personal time to gain their insight and counsel. He describes the enthusiastic support of other librarians such as Edwin Castagna from Long Beach, Enoch Pratt from Baltimore, John Henderson from the Los Angeles County Library, John Smith and Donald Davidson from Santa

\textsuperscript{167} Powell and Handelsman, “The UCLA Library School,” 9.
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Barbara, Edwin Coman from Riverside, and of course, LAPL Librarian Harold Hamill.\textsuperscript{172} Even Berkeley’s library school’s Dean Perry Danton was “always helpful.”\textsuperscript{173} At this time, according to Powell “no one ever worked actively against it. The terrible thing we had to work against was inertia. You can fight hostility; but inertia--it’s like punching a sandbag; it just doesn't move and you only hurt yourself.”\textsuperscript{174}

In 1955, the Library Education Seminar issued its “Credo for Librarians,” which had been inspired by the Engineer’s Creed, a professional pledge adopted by the National Society of Professional Engineers. The Engineer’s Creed had been issued in printed form in June, 1954.\textsuperscript{175} The Engineer’s Creed pledged to give the utmost performance, to participate in none but honest enterprise, to place service before profit, the honor of the profession above personal advantage, and the public welfare above all other considerations. The Credo for Librarians includes many of the engineer’s themes such as service, truth, and belief in high ideals. It reads as follows:

\textit{“The Credo for Librarians}

\textit{Librarian is a calling which offers rich opportunities for dedicated service.}

\textit{The collection and care and transmission of mankind’s recorded knowledge--his deepest thoughts, his lightest fancies, is a privilege and responsibility of high order, a responsibility implying devotion to the ideals of free inquiry and to the search for truth.}

\textit{The library discipline is not an easy one, but one that demands intensive and continuing study, and also an imaginative approach to the existing task of uniting books}
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and readers. Schools of librarianship should be places of inspiration as well as of
instruction, and the voices of their leaders should be strong and clear.

Librarians must rally gifted young men and women to the profession by appeals
to their idealism and their desire for service.

As librarians, we are committed to a life of professional service guided by these
beliefs. “

Another important piece of literature was also published in 1955, which was Edward
Dickson’s University of California at Los Angeles: Its Origin and Formative Years. The work is
beautiful book and story tracing the founding of UCLA from Dickson’s appointment to Board of
Regents in 1913 to the formal dedication of the University of California at Los Angeles in 1930.
Dickson describes the dedication: “Thus were realized the hopes of those of us who labored,
amidst hopes and disappointments, for so many years to bring to the Southland, for the youth of
today and of future generations, a great University.”177 Lawrence Clark Powell provided the
forward for Dickson’s book in which Powell describes how, despite the fact that “the steps which
had to be taken before his vision materialized of a university in southern California [...] often
consisted of one backward and two forward, or two sideways and three forward, [...] there was
always a net gain in progress.”178 Powell attributed this progress largely to Dickson’s
“extraordinary combination” of vision, persistence, persuasiveness, teamwork, and faith.179

176 The credo was reprinted in the June 9 1956 issue of the Oakland Public Library’s Oak Leaves newsletter as
well as vol. 9 no. 7 of the Fly Leaf of Santa Barbara Public Library. Both are found in Box 19, Graduate School of
Library and Information Science. Administrative files (University Archives Record Series 408). UCLA Library
Special Collections, University Archives.
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On May 6, 1955, Dickson received a letter from a young man at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, introducing himself as Andrew Horn. In 1954, the Horns had moved across the country so Andrew could work as head of the library and professor of librarianship at the University of North Carolina. While in Chapel Hill, Horn also served on the North Carolina State Library Board of Trustees, and during the summer of 1955, he was featured on the television program Know Your Library, which was broadcast from University of North Carolina. Horn had written to Edward Dickson at his home address to let him know that he had received Dickson’s book through his membership in the Friends of the UCLA Library, and that he had very much enjoyed reading it. Horn recalls to Dickson having remembered the story of the founding of UCLA from when he was a teen in Los Angeles, and that he had even worked as a newsboy selling the Los Angeles Express, though he admits to Dickson that he was more interested in selling the paper than reading it. Horn wrote to thank Dickson for his great work and notes that “there is one more chapter in UCLA’s history which I look forward to reading -- the establishment of a Library School by Edward A. Dickson and Lawrence C. Powell. That is a work which the two of you have begun and which I know you will not abandon.”

Edward Dickson was undeniably committed to a “School of the Library” at UCLA. It meant the world to him. Sadly, the great Edward Augustus Dickson passed unexpectedly on February 22, 1956, at the age of 76, after several weeks of severe illness. His devoted wife, Wilhelmina, whom he had been married to since 1907, was devastated, as were many others who

---
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knew him. Five hundred people attended his funeral at Wilshire Methodist.\textsuperscript{183} \textsuperscript{184} \textsuperscript{185} Dean Gustave O. Arlt, the Associate Dean of the UCLA Graduate School, delivered the eulogy noting that “few of us had the remotest idea of the amazing scope of his interests.”\textsuperscript{186} Arlt spoke of Dickson’s character, his integrity, and his honesty, kindness, gentleness and loyalty to the State, Nation, and institutions which he loved.”\textsuperscript{187} Arlt stated that “I regard him as probably the greatest influence for good that has ever been for the University of California at Los Angeles.”\textsuperscript{188} President Sproul described him as “not only a prime advocate and vigorous supporter of the University he loved but also its tutelary genius.”\textsuperscript{189}

Dickson was a man for whom jazz was “terra incognita.”\textsuperscript{190} He had a distaste for fiction, except he always read Horace on trips.\textsuperscript{191} His collections included 19th century McGuffey’s Readers schoolbooks, Abraham Lincoln ephemera, and Neo-Babylonian cuneiform tablets.\textsuperscript{192} \textsuperscript{193} His Bible would fall open in places and be marked in the margins.\textsuperscript{194} He loved Los Angeles
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history and Southern California history. He had a soft spot in his heart for books, libraries, and collections, and shortly before his death, he had traveled to Seville, Spain where he found a Columbus library of memorabilia and writing in the Biblioteca Colombiana containing volumes from Columbus’s own personal library. Although Dickson was fascinated by the collection, he was horrified by the fact that the library had no funds for the protection and storage of the volumes and there were leaks in the roof. So he took it upon himself to raise the funds and set up a committee with the mission of protecting the library and doing research work. According to Powell, “Although I disagreed with him later on politics, Modern art, and the need for a special loyalty oath for university employees, he never penalized me nor the library because of our differences. Although tough, he was never mean. He pursued a noble vision, and the realization of it is evident in all the UCLA has become.”
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Chapter 6: Regents Approve

Because the School Library Association and the Public Library Executives Association of Southern California had presented such a tremendous need for trained personnel in their libraries, in 1957, the need for an additional school of librarianship in Southern California was referred to a liaison committee for immediate restudy. The Regents formed the Liaison Committee for Continuing Study of Higher Education in California to study extent to which the need was being met by the facilities available for librarian training in Southern California and appointed Thomas Dabagh as the chair. Powell was glad to have Dabagh as the chair and described him as “shrewd, tactful, and adept,” and credits Dabagh as a major contributor to the momentum which made the library school happen.\(^{197}\) Dabagh, former County Law librarian of Los Angeles and Special legislative assistant to President Sproul, had a strong concern that the population explosion in California which was happening in the 1950s would produce a rapid surge in the need for trained librarians. California’s population in 1950 was approximately 10.5 million and from 1950 to 1960, the population would grow to over 15 million.\(^{198}\) Powell emphatically described the population boom as: “You could see them coming over the border like locusts. The women were getting pregnant faster than ever; babies were being born. My God, it was really a crisis which many of us had foreseen for a long time.”\(^{199}\)

The Liaison Committee’s report was published in December 1958. The report studied enrollment from 1950 to 1957 of part-time and full-time students and staff at Immaculate Heart and the University of Southern California, the number of graduates and kinds of library degrees awarded, the institutes and workshops offered by the existing schools, as well as tuition, student


work and scholarship opportunities. USC and Immaculate Heart were both asked for appraisal of the need for trained librarians and as well as the amount of additional library students which could be accommodated at the time of the report, in 1957. San Jose State College was also approached because their library program, as of 1957, was still the only one in California designated primarily for the preparation of public school libraries. The report recommended that due to expected shortages in the number of trained librarians as well as UCLA’s recruiting potential and ideal location, that a graduate school of library science be established at UCLA and that it become accredited.\footnote{Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education. Education for Librarianship in Southern California: a Study of the Need for an Additional School of Librarianship in Southern California. Berkeley, 1958.} The report also recommended that potential students for UCLA’s library school be recruited from “new sources” so as to avoid taking too many students from the existing library schools in Southern California.\footnote{Ibid, 15.} The report does not elaborate on what the new sources would be, and whether or not this would include the UCLA undergraduate student body. The report noted that UCLA is “admirably equipped with the essentials necessary for a first rate library school.”\footnote{Ibid, 17.} Also in 1957, Powell achieved what he felt was the “best thing [he] did in the field of administration,” in organizing an institute held at UCLA called “A New Look at Library Administration,” sponsored by the extension division and the library, which welcomed enrollees from all over the country.\footnote{Powell, “Looking Back at Sixty,” 443.}

In 1957, Andrew Horn returned to California to work as the college librarian at Occidental College. Powell had the idea that Horn should return to help start the UCLA library school. According to Horn, “Powell was more determined and more confident and was perhaps a
good deal closer to the feeling of librarians in the region, and he tended to be a little more critical of what the existing library schools were doing.” 204 As Powell had travelled around and talked to all the librarians, Horn speculated that in talking to those at Occidental, Powell likely mentioned that when a library school should open at UCLA, he would be interested in recruiting Horn. As a consequence, Horn had to assure Occidental when going to work there that he was not just using it as a stepping-stone to UCLA. According to Powell, Horn’s “whole dream and desire was to return to his own alma mater, UCLA.”205 Horn, however, had a more practical rationale for his eventual return. He believed that the best work he could have accomplished at Occidental was in his early years when he reorganized the library and planned new budget system. Horn did have the idea in mind that he would like to return to UCLA to help start the school, but for Horn it was not as much of a matter of “destiny” as it was for Powell. In a later interview Powell would admit that it was he, Powell, who had the “fate” of his position and his father’s familial relation to Regent Dickson; whereas Horn had the “faith,” in that his contributions to the SLS were fueled by a faith in the future success of the school.206 Powell described how in being fated into the role as the University Librarian for one of, if not the, largest research center in the Southwest, that he must use his “forces” for good.207 Powell’s motivation for continuing Dickon’s fight for the “School of the Library” at UCLA was the result of a force greater than himself. According to Powell, “I was a chosen instrument as it were, and I had to do this.”208
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After meeting with Chancellor Raymond Allen, who was UCLA’s Chancellor from 1952 to 1959, Powell submitted a planning budget and at the last minute was called by California Governor Edmund G. Brown, informing him that a modest 25 to 30 thousand had been allotted for a planning year for the library school. There was cause for celebration in November of 1958 when the Regents finally approved the first phase development of the Schools of Architecture, Dentistry, and Librarianship at UCLA for a total of $78,520. This amount was part of a greater approval of $142,570,429 for the operating budget for the University of California which included allotments for normal merit salary increases, building construction, and new services and activities which, aside from the new schools at UCLA, also included $300,000 for research into air pollution and $224,958 for expansion of agricultural research, among many other endeavors. Powell was told by Horn that Horn would be interested in leaving administrative work in librarianship and coming into a teaching and research role. Powell had been authorized by Chancellor Allen and Dean Vern Knudsen of the Graduate Division to negotiate with Horn to leave Occidental, afterwhich Chancellor Allen had departed for an economic mission in Indonesia, leaving the leadership of the university to Knudsen, who became Acting Chancellor. Horn understood Dickson’s vision and accepted Powell’s offer on the provision that he needed to give Occidental at least six months so that they could select Horn’s successor. Powell, in an unconventional role for a University Librarian, and operating
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under the assumption of approval from Allen and Knudsen, negotiated with Andrew Horn to join him at UCLA in 1959.\textsuperscript{213}

Shortly after Horn’s agreement, the Governor Brown removed about thirty-seven things from the enormous budget including the library school at UCLA. Knudsen had been a strong supporter of professional library education at UCLA and worked with Powell and Governor Brown to restore the budget for the library school. Of all the things removed from the budget only three were restored: one concerning atomic energy, the other, statewide agriculture, and the third was “the little library school at UCLA,” which gave Powell “a strong feeling of participation with atomic energy and statewide agriculture.”\textsuperscript{214} However, in restoring the allotment for a library school at UCLA, only the funds for the operating budget were restored and the budget did not restore the equipment or space provisions. Only a salary for Horn and a secretary's salary were provided. To make matters worse, Chancellor Allen had called Horn around May of 1959, after Horn’s successor had already been named at Occidental, to inform Horn that his appointment had not been approved as a Professor, but rather as a Lecturer, which meant a non-tenure appointment and that there would be no salary advantage in Horn’s leaving Occidental for UCLA.\textsuperscript{215}

Powell had to decide whether to be Dean of the new library school or University Librarian or both. At the Chicago Library School, the Dean and the University Librarian had been the same person at the same time, but, by the late 1950s, it was not common practice amongst library schools. Horn assumed that he would be Planning Officer and Powell would be Dean, but Powell ended up spending most of his time in the library and according to Horn, “I
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don’t remember really whether I was to be Acting Dean, but this didn’t matter because there really wasn’t any purpose in that. I was just to be there. I had some misgivings about whether the appointment was really appropriate, because it had been assured, more-or-less, by telephone and I knew that faculty appointments were made by [the budget] committee.”

Horn was well aware of the budgetary restraints, but another concern which he encountered was in regards to the beginnings of the California Master Plan. The California Master Plan included efforts to divide professional and technical training into the state colleges, whereas universities would only retain certain professional education and graduate education, for example, Medicine and Law. UCLA had closed its Home Economics program, which Horn saw a sign of “the university drawing its line.”

He was unsure of where Librarianship would fall, and found that enthusiasm for the school was not universal and there were a number of people who only wanted to increase traditional academics or the existing professional schools, rather than found a new professional school.

It was in fact a lack of professionalism which most struck Andrew Horn in coming to UCLA. Chancellor Allen abruptly resigned in June of 1959. Allen had been encouraged to do so after it was found out that he had taken part in making illegal payments of $40 a month each to football players at UCLA that had not been sanctioned by the Pacific Coast Conference. The PCC was a college athletic conference of as many as 10 colleges with competitions in football basketball and baseball. In 1956, the conference's commissioner Victor O. Schmidt claims to have attempted to conduct an investigation, from which he was barred by Chancellor Allen. Chancellor Allen denies that he blocked the investigation and claims to have provided Schmidt

---
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with information regarding the booster clubs, which along with the alumni organizations, were being used to fund the illegal monthly payments to football players.\textsuperscript{219} Despite Allen’s denial, UCLA was fined $95,000 by the PCC and placed on a probationary period until July 1, 1959.\textsuperscript{220} After his resignation, Allen became the Director of the International Cooperation Administration in Indonesia.\textsuperscript{221} With Allen’s resignation, Horn felt as though he was arriving just as UCLA’s administration lost a lot of leadership and support for the library school. Horn knew that even while Allen was still Chancellor, Allen had an unfavorable relationship with the Budget Committee for obvious reasons, and after Allen left, Horn found little support for restoring the budget for the facilities and equipment. Horn did not even know to whom in the administration he was supposed to report and when he first arrived, he did not even have a place to sit down.\textsuperscript{222}

Horn was able to make an office for himself in the downstairs level of the library, but as far as class space was concerned, he still faced a considerable struggle to get the space reassigned to the library. He knew he needed to get the program approved, along with classes and faculty, and he knew this would require an academic approach, but academic work was not something in which he or Powell had ever specialized. Horn felt as though he and Powell were both coming from more of a non-academic background. Horn found himself in a predicament which he dubbed a “personal problem,” wherein he had been convinced that the opportunity to join Powell in the building of the School of Library service at UCLA would be a fantastic opportunity, but then as soon as he had given his notice and found his successor at Occidental, he
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became inundated with warning signs that things would not go smoothly at UCLA. Horn believed that the school should have been finalized before he was ever asked to accept the appointment, and he admits that had he not already gone as far as to have secured his successor at Occidental, he might not have ever left for UCLA, “and perhaps if I had not accepted, I’d have been personally better off… but that’s quite questionable too.” Horn decided to himself not to continue for more than a year with a non-tenure appointment, but admitted that even that would be challenging.

Over the summer of 1959, Horn did an enormous amount of research into accreditation, other schools’ curriculums, and advice from other library school leaders. An area of growing importance for Horn was that of accreditation. ALA standards had recently been revised and according to Horn, “I thought that I had to look at what could be accredited by the American Library Association. It seemed to me that, no matter how good a program we had, if it wasn't one that would be acceptable with the national accrediting agency, we would attract some very interesting students, but we would very seriously limit their possibilities of employment, because, increasingly, the best library systems are specifying a degree from an accredited library school.” With the help of Powell’s administrative assistant Barbara Boyd and Horn’s secretary Ellie Schuetze, Horn studied and analyzed the course offerings at the accredited library school. They compared this research with the past work of the Library Education Seminar, the discussions of which had largely centered around the ways in which the current schools could be improved, and saw that in creating a quality curriculum to meet with the written accreditation standards of ALA, it was important to emphasize bibliography, and that a book-centered
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curriculum was essential. They paid particular attention to advice from the Dean and the faculty of the Berkeley library school and Berkeley’s program was very influential. Horn believed that by patterning his curriculum after core elements of the Berkeley Library School, it would help to facilitate an exchange of students. After compiling an enormous amount of research over the summer of 1959, Horn created a document entitled “Education for Librarianship at UCLA.”

By October of 1959, Horn had a telephone in his office and had secured employment for Ellie Schultze as his full-time secretary, who had been previously splitting her duties between helping Horn and helping Powell. Horn was able to call and consult with Martha Boaz directly. Although he found her to be nice and cordial, she did seem concerned with the effect that the UCLA library school would have on her school. Others were much more supportive. Horn had also secured the support of the Acting Chancellor Vern Oliver Knudsen, who had known Horn when Horn was a graduate student at UCLA, when Knudsen was Dean of the Graduate School. Knudsen believed in the library school at UCLA and was very sympathetic to Powell and Horn’s efforts. In September, 1959, Chancellor Knudsen appointed an Advisory Committee. The duties of the advisory committee were to create an official program and curriculum of the school, including course descriptions, admission requirements, as well as the requirements for the M.L.S. degree. The committee would also work to figure out the limitations of the class size and half-time enrollment, and finally, to not only create the criteria for the selection of a faculty, but to provide sound nominations of individual faculty members, as well as for an inter-campus advisory council. The members of Knudsen’s committee that were tasked with these goals were:

Gustave O. Arlt, Dean of the Graduate Division and Professor of Germanic Languages, Chairman of the Committee;

---
L.M.K. Boelter, Dean of the College of Engineering, Chairman of the Engineering Department and Professor of Engineering;

Roy M. Dorcus, Divisional Dean of the Life Sciences and Professor of Psychology;

Thomas P. Jenkin, Professor of Political Science;

Horace W. Magoun, Professor of Anatomy;

George E. Mowry, Divisional Dean of Social Sciences and Professor of History; and

Ralph S. Rice, Professor of Law.

Andrew H. Horn: the Staff Officer of the Committee, was selected for the position by Knudsen himself, at which time it was established that Horn’s title would be Lecturer.²²⁷

Chapter 7: The Argument

Then it happened: The August 1959 issue of the Southern California Chapter of the Special Libraries Association Bulletin was published. Robert Lewis, a law librarian from Los Angeles, who had worked for the Melveny & Myers law firm, and who served on the Executive and Advisory Board of the Southern California Chapter of the Special Libraries Association, had written an article called “A Minority View,” and Frank Bennett, a librarian at Riker Laboratories and the editor of the Bulletin, had written its introduction providing an enthusiastic endorsement for Lewis’s stance, which was, at its core, unabashedly opposed to a library school at UCLA.  

Lewis’s article was based on a speech which he had, unbeknownst to Powell and Horn, delivered to the audience at the May 18, 1959 meeting of the Executive and Advisory Board of the Southern California Chapter, wherein Lewis encouraged library organizations to take a stand against the establishment of a third library school in Southern California. Based on Lewis’s speech, a motion was passed by committee, of which Lewis was a member to “obtain a clearer picture of the problem.” However, the first that Powell and Horn had even ever heard of this inquiry was in November 1959, after the Southern California Chapter of the Special Libraries Association President Doris Banks wrote to Powell on behalf of the Bulletin to distance herself from Lewis's article.

---
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and her organization from Lewis and Bennett, and to give Powell background information on how the article had came to be.\textsuperscript{231}

After his speech, Lewis had written to the presidents of all the library organizations he could find listed. In corresponding with those who were willing to respond to him in regards to whether or not UCLA should open a third library school in Southern California, only one respondent reported official action in favor, five no action, one was described as being “group favorable,” there were three personal expressions in favor, and one personal belief “too late to oppose.”\textsuperscript{232} It is unknown whose response belonged to whom. The findings of the inquiry noted that, although Martha Boaz of USC and Sister Mary Regis of Immaculate Heart found the statistics concerning capacity and enrollment available in the December 1958 Liaison Committee report to be valid, it was felt that this report failed to present a complete picture because “much had been omitted.”\textsuperscript{233} The committee, of which Lewis was a part, determined that the 1956-57 figures of enrollment which had not yet been published presented “a better picture.” Committee chairman Margaret R. Anderson, noted that she felt that after her conversation with Powell that he had made a logical and reasonable argument for the establishment of the school. She also summed up the situation by stating that “since the library school at the University of California is an accomplished fact with Andrew H. Horn appointed as Lecturer in Library Services and registration scheduled for the fall of 1960, it is hoped that a third library school will help the administrators of the two established schools obtain more funds and that the importance of their
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schools will be recognized even more.”234 This statement confirmed that, despite Lewis's objections, the library school was by then a reality which would proceed, and the committee could do nothing more than send its well wishes. Lewis, however, was not ready to give up.

Lewis’s article’s main criticism was that the School of Library Service at UCLA was an unnecessary expenditure. Lewis believed that since the University of Southern California and Immaculate Heart College were, as of 1959, already offering Master’s degrees in library education, opening a third school in Southern California would be an unwise expenditure of tax revenue and would adversely affect the already low enrollment numbers at USC and Immaculate Heart. Lewis used the analogy of a hypothetical situation in which two mills were operating at two-thirds efficiency, and proposed that, rather than to build a new mill, the best solution was to increase the efficiency of either existing mill. The mills, to Lewis, were symbolic of USC and Immaculate Heart, both of which had room in their library degree programs for more students. Lewis sites the statistics obtained from his committee’s investigation: Immaculate Heart had a capacity of approximately 150 with an enrollment of 70 and USC had a capacity of 300-350, with an enrollment of 195-225.235 Given these low numbers, Lewis argued that the “group character” of librarians obliged support of the existing Southern California library degree programs by discouraging a new and competing program. Lewis felt that the opening of such a program was evidence of how the UC system was “calculated to hurt private education.”236

SCCSLA Bulletin Editor Frank Bennett, who earlier in the edition had announced his retirement, also provided a troublesome introduction for Lewis’s piece. Herein Bennett, like Lewis, recommends expansion of the existing library education graduate degree programs in
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Southern California as they “do not cost the taxpayer one cent and are more than adequate,” and he also suggests that the low enrollment numbers at either school are not due to the prohibitive costs of private education, but rather, a lack of desirable library students and job candidates.²³⁷ Bennett suggests that candidate quality could be improved by offering better wages for graduates of library education programs, but then Bennett’s editorial quickly descends into a vicious personal attack on Lawrence Clark Powell. He demands an explanation from the Regents as to why they chose “a librarian for this high position who has the dubious distinction of having been a registered COMMUNIST [sic],” referring to that article from 1951. Bennett then closes his introduction with a cryptic question, asking his readership if they have ever read “The Naked Communist.”²³⁸ The book which Bennett refers to is one in which former FBI Agent W. Cleon Skousen, describes a Communist plot for world domination.²³⁹

²³⁷ Bennett, “An Editor's Note,” 8.
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Librarians throughout Southern California were outraged and many wrote a number of letters to express how they felt about what the Bulletin had published. One librarian in particular, Roy Hollerman, the Librarian at Scripps Institution of Oceanography at UC La Jolla, had written a series of letters to all involved, to come to the defense of Powell and UCLA and to show his support. Hollerman was thorough and direct in his responses. Regarding Lewis and Bennett’s concerns that the existing schools are not operating at capacity, Hollerman wrote to the Bulletin and copied Powell and Horn to state that “There comes a point of diminishing returns when the higher the number of students attending, the lower the standards must be placed as regards the time and attention given to their training.”\(^\text{240}\) Hollerman also pointed out that the Immaculate Heart library school, although “offering excellent courses” is not an accredited school, showing that Andrew Horn was not alone in regards to his perceived importance of ALA accreditation.\(^\text{241}\) Hollerman added in his letter to the Bulletin that he felt that the lower cost of attending a state institution would encourage more young people who could not afford a fifth year at a private university to enter the profession. He believed that USC “has been holding its own in the other fields against any encroachments of the University of California and its branches,” and speculated that the school at UCLA might even raise the standards of library training to an even higher level.\(^\text{242}\) In a separate letter Hollerman wrote to Frank Bennett personally to address Bennett’s attack on Powell, telling Bennett that “We are all for the Democratic freedom of
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speech. We all greatly admire your strong patriotism, but what you had to gain by false
accusations it is difficult to understand. It is my belief that a human being never makes any real
points for himself by trying to lower another individual in the eyes of his fellow man.”

On November 25, 1959, Andrew Horn wrote a letter to Roy Hollerman, thanking him for his
willingness to protest the Bulletin’s August issue. Horn states to Hollerman that “This whole
thing, as often happens when persons lose their heads—has probably backfired. I suspect the
Southern California Chapter of SLA lost a lot more than the UCLA School of Library service
did.”

Other examples of support include a letter to the Bulletin and copied to Lawrence Powell
from E. Jorgensen, the Chief Librarian of the Navy Electronic Laboratory dated September 18,
1959, addressed to Doris Banks, the Chapter President. Jorgensen wrote Banks to “protest the
attack on personalities which appeared in the last issue of the Chapter Bulletin,” and added that
“There is in my own opinion no reason why the official journal of a professional organization
should print an unprovoked, personal attack. There is no justification for a writer to attempt to
bolster his arguments by an appeal to the emotions, especially through the device of a totally
unwarranted and vicious attack on the motives and character of the principals in this case. There
is also no justification for “sponsoring” such attacks by printing them in the Bulletin.”

Similarly Jean Legg, of the California Research Corporation Standard Oil Company of
California, had written Banks on September 11, 1959, to let it be known that “Regardless of the
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circumstances, or of my personal opinion of the proposed library school, I am ashamed to be associated with a group which has sanctioned by publication an attack inappropriate undignified, unprofessional, and frankly fanatic. If I had any choice about being listed as a member of the Southern California Chapter--and I believe I do not--I would resign. As it is, I wish to disapprove absolutely of the actions of the chapter in this matter.” Banks replied to Legg by detaching herself from Lewis and Bennett by stating that: “At SLA Headquarters in June I discussed this as a problem, and wholeheartedly agreed with Miss Lucius’s counsel that in our real need for trained librarians, our only stand can be to support library schools.” Banks goes on to add that, “Further, the Board voted to not inform SLA Headquarters unless trouble arises but attempt to handle our problems ourselves. They voted to inform Dr. Powell that the special meeting was called and that the Bulletin issue represents personal opinion and not necessarily the feeling of the Board, the Advisory Council, nor the Membership. They voted to not distribute a special apology issue, but to encourage letters to the editor and expression of more personal opinions. Much as I deplore this thing ever happening, and much as I myself feel like running away, I feel we as a Board are trying to meet the situation in a panicked, a throughout [sic] way. We shall not undo the wrong; we may, however, build some support for Dr. Powell’s new school.” Banks then wrote Powell personally to say “I am shocked, as I’ve been shocked these two weeks. I am most apologetic for having any connection with the organization publishing this thing. Having survived in Boston in the days of the Congressional investigations at Harvard and the Philbrick
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attacks, I resent any association smacking of more of the same.”\(^{249}\) Herbert Philbrick had been a Boston advertising executive who had been recruited by the FBI to infiltrate the Communist Party as a spy.

Although many of these letters were addressed to Powell, because Powell was busy finalizing his affairs as University Librarian and preparing the library for his successor, much of the correspondence of the School of Library Service fell upon that of Andrew Horn. On December first, 1959, Horn wrote a personal and private list of rebuttals to Lewis’s arguments. According to Horn “[Lewis] wrote to the presidents of thirteen library organizations in Southern California. Five replied, four were personally delighted at prospect of the school.”\(^{250}\) Andrew Horn could not see that the establishment of the school at Immaculate Heart had had any negative effect on USC’s enrollment and Horn asks why, if the Immaculate Heart and USC schools offer superior programs, would students prefer UCLA? “Answer, obviously, is cost,” Horn writes, adding that he knows individuals who would come to UCLA but not USC nor Immaculate Heart as a matter of cost.\(^{251}\) In regards to a particularly verbose statement of Lewis that “it is fallacious, shocking, contrary to good sense, shallow, ill considered, etc. to contend that a school at UCLA will improve recruiting,” Horn reminds Lewis that UCLA is the largest university in Southern California, in terms of the annual amount of Bachelor’s degrees conferred as well as in terms of enrollment of graduate students. Horn adds that “There is a very good reason to believe that the faculties of UCLA would direct students to professional librarianship if
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a school existed on the campus.”

Regarding Lewis’s argument that Immaculate Heart and USC’s standards need to be improved and that the library profession should “lend a hand,” Horn personally thinks that if the USC library school is better than UCLA’s, then the best potential students would go to USC, and suggests that the three schools could each develop a special emphasis. Horn adds that “The profession should certainly help USC and UCLA,” pointing out that UCLA is no less worthy of support from the library profession. Regarding Lewis’s accusation that the University of California is acting with calculated intent to hurt private education, Horn writes “I don’t believe it.”

He points out that Lewis was educated in private institutions with a BS from Princeton, LLB from Harvard, and BS from Columbia, and says that “I for one could not have gotten my education in private institutions, and there is good many like me. In fact private institutions could not at present do the job.” He also adds that the establishment of other professional schools and graduate programs in different fields at UCLA have not hurt any corresponding programs at USC. Horn points out that even though Lewis laments that there was no vote of which he was included, Lewis still calls his article “A Minority View,” recognizing that the majority of those who would vote against a library school at UCLA would still find themselves in the minority, should a hypothetical vote have taken place. In addressing the Leigh Report, Horn notes that although it predicted that the existing Southern California library schools should be able to recruit and train enough librarians to meet the need, they have not been able to do so. Horn ends his notes by asserting that “The Joint Staff Report concluded that a school at
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UCLA should be able to recruit and train some additional librarians [...] It really is up to Mr. Lewis to prove this is impossible – his arguments have not convinced me.”255

This handwritten note, which as far as can be confirmed, was never sent, presented nor published, was nevertheless written in two different colors so as to emphasize certain points in red and saved within University archives for posterity. While Horn was writing these points, a letter was already enroute from Robert Lewis to Lawrence Powell which had been written Sunday, November 29th, 1959 to acknowledge the upcoming Association Chapter meeting at the UCLA campus that coming Friday. Lewis made it clear that his views regarding the UCLA library school “remain unchanged” and that “[...] in this instance I shall not want to go to the dinner and meeting Friday unless I can know that my presence will not be disagreeable or in any way embarrassing to you or Dr. Horn. I am confident you will understand my sincerity in asking you to be absolutely candid in telling me how you feel.”256 In his response letter which he addressed to Robert Lewis written November 30, 1959, Powell thanks Lewis for writing and assured him that his “attendance at the dinner meeting Friday night will not embarrass us.”257 He then defers debate at the dinner by saying, “Although the meeting Friday night is not planned for discussion, I am sure there will be opportunities in the future for frank discussion of library education in general and here at UCLA in particular.”258 That Powell says he looks forward to “meeting and greeting” Lewis at the dinner confirms that the two had not met prior to December, 1959.

255 Ibid, 4.

256 Robert Lewis, letter to Lawrence Powell, November 29, 1959. Box 19, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Administrative files (University Archives Record Series 408). UCLA Library Special Collections, University Archives.

257 Lawrence Powell, letter to Robert Lewis, November 30, 1959. Box 19, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Administrative files (University Archives Record Series 408). UCLA Library Special Collections, University Archives.

258 Ibid.
The only record of public statement from UCLA regarding the Lewis debacle came from that very meeting of the Special Libraries Association Chapter at UCLA, on Friday December 4, 1959 when Horn presented his paper “Education for Librarianship.” In his introductory speech, he only addressed the incident to say that what had been written was “contemptible rather than challenging,” afterwhich he did not deign to address the attack any further, and rather chose to highlight the incredible history of the School of Library Service. He told of the immense amount of groundwork established prior to his and Powell’s contributions and let all in attendance know that it was Regent Dickson who had been promoting the idea of a library school at UCLA since 1930, and it was not until the early 1950s that Dickson was finally able to convince Lawrence Clark Powell that resources of the UCLA Library could support the school. Horn boasts that UCLA is now an ideal center for library studies by touting its seventeen well-stocked and staffed libraries, as well as the recently-acquired “Western Data Processing Center with its IBM Type 709 Data Processing System,” which Horn mentioned was already being used in a number of projects related to the library. Thus the advisory committee for the School of Library Service proceeded with its planning year.259

---
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Chapter 9: The Planning Year and Dedication

The year from September 1959 to September 1960 would be used to accomplish many preliminary tasks in the establishment of a new school of librarianship at UCLA. These tasks included further planning of the details of the program so that it may meet the accreditation standards of the California Department of Education and the American Library Association, recruiting faculty and staff, evaluating applications, development of an operating budget estimate for the next 5-10 years, providing outreach and progress reports to the CDE and ALA, establishment of a liaison with other institutions which have programs for training librarians, particularly those already partnered with Berkeley, proposing to the School of Education, Los Angeles a joint program leading to the California Credential in School Librarianship, developing an administrative organization, and ordering equipment and supplies.260 The School of Library Service was set to open September 19, 1960.

As the deadline grew close, the SLS quickly accomplished its goals. The criticisms of Lewis and Bennett had not deterred applicants in the slightest, much the contrary, there were way more applications than could ever be admitted. As soon as the Regents had approved the school in November 1958, Powell had begun to receive informal applications and inquiries from potential students. By the close of the planning year, Powell had received over 500 applications and inquiries from people in California as well as 33 other states and 11 foreign countries.261 Since the class was limited to only 50 full-time students, with the assistance of the Admission section of the Graduate Division, the committee, and other librarians with whom the library school seminar had been in contact, Powell was able to recruit other librarians to conduct
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interviews with potential students on his behalf. Support was offered from many local institutions who generously provided facilities and funds to support work-study programs for students. These institutions included The Los Angeles City Public Library, the Los Angeles County Public Library, the Santa Monica Public Library, the Occidental College Library, and the West Los Angeles Veterans Administration Center. The Technical Book Company of Los Angeles offered to supply a substantial collection of reference books and the antiquarian booksellers, Zeitlin and Ver Brugge, were approved by the Regents to support a five-year Lectureship in Bibliography, allowing the school to invite distinguished guest lecturers.262

In recruiting the School of Library Service’s faculty, Lawrence Clark Powell had a belief that outstanding teaching could be expected only from people who had been seasoned in library work, and at the same time, he deplored a trend to staff library school faculties with young instructors whose chief qualification was the PhD degree.263 Many of the original faculty which the SLS recruited had received their library degrees from the UC Berkeley Library School. Although this was noted as a negative in the SLS’s 1962 ALA inspection, Powell defends his faculty in that, “I don’t think the Berkeley Library School under Mitchell, Coulter, and Sisler ever had any copyright philosophy with which they indoctrinated their graduates.”264 Powell then admits that practicality, not a philosophical agenda, was the reason behind the large percent of Berkeley graduates within his faculty, “It wasn’t really a philosophical inner circle, it was an expedient inner circle—that is, here were the people that were possible to start with, without going through an enormous amount of nationwide screening […] you simply couldn’t have done
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that and got the thing open.”265 He goes on to explain that most of the faculty were picked on the basis of their success as librarians, and made an important statement regarding his own foundational philosophy in that “A lot of people didn’t and still don’t regard librarianship as a true academic discipline. I don’t know that I do myself.”266

By the time faculty and preliminary curriculum announcements were made in the annual report of the planning year, Andrew Horn had finally been named Associate Professor and Assistant Dean. Horn taught Bibliography, Reference and Documentation and the Introduction to Library Service joint staff class section on library history. The other founding faculty offered the first class of students a broad range of courses taught by a powerhouse of instructors. These instructors included Frances Clarke Sayers, a well-renowned children's librarian, author of children's books, and lecturer on children's literature, who, as a lecturer in the English Department at UCLA, had played an integral role in helping the Library Education Seminar to plan curriculum. She had taught for several years as a member of Dean Mitchell's faculty at Berkeley, and at the School of Library Service would teach courses in children’s library service. Faculty member Barbara Boyd, who had a Master’s in public administration from UCLA and twenty-years’ experience working as a county librarian in Modoc County and a field consultant in the state library, would teach public library work at the city, country, regional, and federal levels. Tatiana P. Keating, a native of Russia and who had received her graduate and undergraduate degrees at Berkeley and an MLS from USC, and had organized the high school library at Reseda High School in San Fernando Valley when study body well to 3,000, would teach school library service. And perhaps the most famous, Seymore Lubetzky, a world-renowned scholar of cataloging, was recruited to teach cataloging and classification. Lubetzky
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had more than a quarter century of experience in the field. He received his BA from UCLA and MA from Berkeley, as well as degree from Berkeley’s library school. Lubetzky was friends with Powell, having begun his library career in the UCLA library in 1936 as a junior with Powell and their friendship had endured.\textsuperscript{267} \textsuperscript{268} In persuading Lubetzky to return to UCLA, Powell promised him freedom to continue his leadership in international cataloging standardization and also the freedom to write his magnum opus. Also Powell himself would work as an instructor. Powell’s teaching experience included his work at the Columbia Library School in 1954, and as well as teaching in the UCLA English department. Five of the six UCLA School of Library Service faculty, all but Sayers, had attended UC Berkeley’s library school.\textsuperscript{269}

The opening dedication ceremony of the School of Library Service took place Sunday afternoon, September 18, 1960 during which time a noteworthy speech was given by Paul Horgan. Horgan was a Southwestern author of fiction, biography, and history who had previously, between 1926 and 1943, been librarian of New Mexico’s military institute at Roswell. In his speech entitled “One of the Quietest Things,” Horgan said, “It is an occasion which marks yet another stride of the University toward excellence and inclusiveness in its embrace of the whole spirit of man.”\textsuperscript{270} In his speech, Horgan describes having met Powell in a bookstore in Albuquerque and going for iced coffee at a nearby hotel and having a good talk about books, writing, travel, research, and life. During their talk, Powell told Horgan of Powell’s “visionary hope” for a library school at UCLA and Horgan said that if the school ever does open,
he would like to see it, to which Powell quickly replied, “When we are ready to open, you come and give the speech of dedication!”271 The philosophy which would continue to resonate throughout the school is reflected in “One of the Quietest Things” where it says “For the very word library is now in itself too narrow to describe the repository of such records.”272 Horgan asked the students how they would like to be able to see and hear Julius Caesar, Shakespeare, Napoleon and Abraham Lincoln on “sound film” and told how future generations would be able to do just that with figures such as Eisenhower. Even the newspaper reporter covering the event was aware of the importance of the SLS in stating that “The new school has a capacity for only 50 students but at least is a beginning to relieve the acute shortage of librarians which plagues the entire United States.”273 “One of the Quietest Things” proved enormously popular with letters arriving from as far as Johannesburg to request a copy from Powell. For this reason, Lawrence Clark Powell saw to it that 500 copies be printed and distributed from the SLS “as a remembrance of its natal day.”274

Just a few days later, on September 23, 1960, Chancellor Franklin David Murphy delivered his inaugural address.275 Murphy had succeeded Acting Chancellor Vern Knudsen after Knudsen had personally given Murphy a tour of the campus earlier in the year when convincing him to join UCLA.276 During his speech, Murphy set forth his goals for UCLA as a university in
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stating that his objective is to lead UCLA to “major scholarly distinction in worldwide terms.” 277

He told the audience that “if the richest nation in the world cannot find adequate funds to support the highest quality and breadth of education and research, our national values have become so eroded and perverted that the future for us would appear very dim indeed.” 278
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Chapter 10: The Thesis

Which brings us to the crux of this thesis: Were Robert Lewis and Frank Bennett right or wrong? Was a library school at UCLA a justified decision which had been a long time in development, or simply part of a plot to destroy private education? The arguments which Lewis and Bennett had made against the school were that UCLA would take business away from the existing schools, that it would keep the current schools from expanding, that it would use funds and resources to create the new school for the purpose of solving a problem (the need for trained librarians) that could be solved with less expenditure by expanding the existing schools, and lastly, but most memorably, that there is the argument on Bennett’s part of the communist allegations against Lawrence Clark Powell. Although, sadly, Edward Dickson was not alive to deal with this argument as swiftly and adeptly as he had done in the past, the notion that the validity of the idea to create a library school at UCLA could be compromised because the founding Dean had once registered as a Communist over two decades prior becomes all the more absurd given the fact that Powell himself had initially not been convinced of UCLA’s ability to support the school. As the aforementioned history informs us, Powell would not be fully convinced until 1951, when the one of the most anti-communist Regents, one of the very Regents who had strongly supported the Loyalty Oath and President McCarthy's HUAC investigations, who had been an active progressive Republican and successful newspaperman and banker, was the one to convince Powell that UCLA should have a “School of the Library,” notably convincing him shortly after coming to his defense for the very thing that eight years later, his most verbose critic would try to indict him for--his communist affiliations. According to Powell, “no one was more anti-communistic than Dickson.”

279 The fact that the President of

the Western Savings and Loan had been the strongest and most enduring supporter on record of the library school at UCLA should attest to the argument that the school was not founded as part of a plot to hurt private education nor private business in general, much the contrary, in many ways it promoted free enterprise by offering the students more choices when selecting which school is right for them.

In many ways, the Regent approval to establish the library school at UCLA may be seen as a tribute to Edward Dickson. As a significant founder of UCLA before it was even UCLA, and one of UCLA’s strongest supporters from its founding to day of his death, Dickson had envisioned that UCLA would have all the professional schools, and he especially had a place in his heart for his “School of the Library.” A man of books and an avid collector, a defender of libraries and a Library Board member, the library school at UCLA was enormously important to Dickson. That he did not live to see its founding is one of the saddest, yet unknown, tragedies of UCLA history. For someone who achieved such a grand vision to have created UCLA into all that it had become literally from the ground up, and as a man who had a reputation for only promoting endeavors which would be most beneficial to society, it makes sense that Dickson’s vision for a professional school of library education at his university would be honored after his untimely passing, not only because of a matter of legacy, but because his track record for beneficial endeavors had been so successful, giving a precedent for great potential to his idea of a “School of the Library.”

The fact that UCLA was able to model its program so closely to Berkeley, and through the UC system, facilitate joint programs and opportunities, also adds to the case for a library school at UCLA. By the time UCLA’s library school was established, UCLA also had one of the top libraries on the West Coast. According to Lawrence Powell in the annual report of the planning year regarding the budget, “It is evident that the University intends to provide the funds
and facilities required by a graduate library school which must operate at the level of excellence attained by existing schools which have been accredited by the American Library Association.”\textsuperscript{280} ALA did not normally consider accreditation until a school had been in operation for three years, but even before UCLA began offering classes at the SLS, ALA was already studying the program and planning for an accreditation visit at the end of the 1960/61 academic year. Powell felt that the close similarity of the program to Berkeley’s School of Librarianship, the fact that the Advisory Council of the School of Librarianship at Berkeley was being expanded to become that University of California Advisory Council on Education and Librarianship, and the proposal to invite graduates of the UCLA School of Library Service to membership in the UC School of Librarianship Alumni Association, all helped to promote the case for an early accreditation of UCLA’s program. Although the efforts on the part of UCLA’s School of Library service to seek accreditation, along with Andrew Horn’s previous statements on the matter, and Holleman's letter pointing out that Immaculate Heart was not accredited, accreditation by ALA was still not as important in 1959 as it become in the decades since and Immaculate Heart still had a well-reputed program even without ALA accreditation.

Even though both Martha Boaz and Sister Mary Regis had expressed their concerns regarding the library school at UCLA, Horn notes that “[Lewis] has spoken and has attempted to get thirteen library organizations in Southern California to agree with him. I am not aware that many organizations, IHC and USC included, have joined forced with him,” and no evidence had been found to indicate that they had.\textsuperscript{281} Although all three Southern California library schools were encompassing of a broad enough curriculum so that the attendee could, after graduation, choose from a number of career paths, Immaculate Heart maintained a reputation for training
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school librarians, USC had a reputation for training public librarians, and UCLA had a reputation for training academic librarians. The scheduling also affected the students which were attracted to which school. For example, USC was, according to Boaz, “kind of geared to people who were working, so you could take courses on Saturdays, you could take evening courses, and you didn't have to register for full-time courses. You could be working and be working toward your degree at the same time.”\(^{282}\) Since each of the schools had a form of specialization, and since the need for trained librarians continued to grow until the late 1960s, enrollment never suffered at Immaculate Heart nor USC due to the opening of UCLA’s School of Library Service.

Although Boaz admits that there was tension be in the beginning between the two schools, a number of librarians in the area talked with her about it, including Harold Hammill and John Henderson, the Los Angeles City and County librarians, respectively. They had lunch with Boaz and assured her of their loyalty and support to her school. During an interview in 1963, Powell pointed out that “The enrollment at the USC library school has gone higher than it’s ever been. It’s now at it’s highest enrollment and the establishment of the UCLA library school has not jeopardized USC.”\(^ {283}\) USC’s library school would in fact continue to enjoy success until 1985 when a decision was announced, with which Martha Boaz’s successor Roger Greer did not agree, that a $55-million library would be built at the same time they were announcing the closure of the library school.\(^ {284}\) Boaz had retired in 1978 and was no longer in the position of Dean by the time the school closed in 1986. She “did all she could,” but was not well-treated by USC, and she was denied the occupancy of the building that she had helped to


As a worse fate, like her forefather Everett Perry, although she lived to see her library school shut down, she did not live to see it reinstated, as she died in 1995, and a program in librarianship at USC was not offered again until January of 2017.

Regarding the announcement to close the USC school while building a new library, Greer is quoted as saying, “They tell me when it’s finished, they’ll have one of the greatest research facilities in the country, well, they’ll have one of the greatest warehouses full of wood and chemicals, but research is still a human activity […] you might as well claim 50 million parking places are just as important as books because unless you’re talking about someone using them, it’s meaningless.” The reason for the decommissioning of the USC library school given by the Vice Provost Robert Biller was: “You have to recognize this field is going through a very difficult period of change—change in virtually every dimension you could imagine: in the way the field is conceptualized, how it is supported, character of research, of education, literally our fundamental idea of what a library should be is being challenged […] It’s clear it will be a generation before all of this gets sorted out. So the real issue, then, is: Is this an area where the university can marshal strength for the long haul?” Biller went on to describe how a study committee was formed to assess the pros and cons of the library school at USC, and found that although enrollment was up (enrollment was slightly more than 100 students), it was still USC’s smallest graduate school on campus. Since Biller found grants and aid to be insignificant and no benefactors on the horizon, it was decided that the school should close.
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Greer had lamented that the library community had become enamored with the technologies of the library and lost sight of their reason for being. It has been speculated that as the USC library school was closing, circa mid-1980s, there existed a sentiment that universities were “de-committing” library schools because the profession had become technical and that “there is no conceptual substance requiring research or advanced degrees,” and that “USC discontinued Roger's School because of the persistence of the technical perception on the part of the Administration.” Interestingly, Biller's prediction that it would take a generation before USC gets sorted out proved more or less correct, thirty years being about as long as it took for USC to reopen an ALA-accredited program. The answer to Bennett's question as to whether or not USC survived the opening of a library school at UCLA is yes, as the library school at USC did last for fifty consecutive years and nearly twenty five years after the founding of UCLA, which proves wrong Lewis's point that opening a third school would adversely affect the enrollment of the existing schools. UCLA did not have a negative effect on USC's library school's enrollment; enrollment at USC's library school was up, and that was not the reason for its closure, which turned out to be merely a hiatus.

The establishment of a library school at UCLA also had less of an effect on Immaculate Heart College than the controversies which plagued Immaculate Heart in the 1960s. The Sisters had disbanded in the late 1960s after several years of feuding with Rome, and especially with Cardinal James Francis McIntyre, the American prelate of the Roman Catholic Church and Archbishop of Los Angeles from 1948 to 1970. Due to the Sisters’ controversial practices, McIntyre barred the Sisters from teaching within the Archdiocese in 1967. These practices included abandoning the habit, eliminating daily prayer, taking part in “encounter group therapy”
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sessions with psychologist Carl Rogers and the Esalen Institute, and, most egregious, the refusal to recognize ecclesiastical authority.\(^{291}\) Over two-hundred nuns left Immaculate Heart by 1969, and of the remaining sisters, 354 left the faith but retained the campus property. The fifty-four nuns who maintained their orthodoxy moved to Wichita, Kansas where they continued to operate a teacher training school.\(^{292}\) Although little information exists regarding the fate of the library school at Immaculate Heart, a small newspaper clipping from 1972 reveals that a party was held to note the closing of the library school with a wine-tasting for alumni on Sunday, February 27, 1972 from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. at 781 Prospect Ave, in Pasadena, an historical private residence built in 1909 which is often referred to as “The Hindry House.”\(^{293}\) This Arts and Crafts style home was designed by Arthur and Alfred Heineman, and for three decades was owned and cared for by Albert and Marka Hibbs. Marka Hibbs was a longtime librarian at Flintridge Preparatory School.\(^{294}\) Financial difficulties which resulted from the dissolution of the nuns' direction and subsequent loss of support forced the entire Immaculate Heart College to close in 1981, however, the Immaculate Heart College Center offered Master's degrees in Feminist Spirituality and Global Education until 2000.\(^{295, 296}\)

Although the Northern California library schools were not of concern to the Bulletin critics Lewis and Bennett, their fates are still important in the defense of a library school at UCLA. Berkeley’s Library School had begun offering a Ph.D. and a Doctor of Library Science
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(DLS) degree program in 1954 and a Master of Library Science degree (MLS) in 1955, and continued to thrive until 1995, when what had evolved into the School of Library and Information Studies at Berkeley closed and became the School of Information Management and Systems that same year. Although it was technically a different school and no longer ALA-accredited, much of the curriculum and skills learned were very similar. According to Patrick G. Wilson, former Dean of UC Berkeley's School of Information Management and Systems, “I was looking at some pieces of paper, the list of courses which are formally offered in the new school, and then the list of courses which are actually taught in the school, and the difference is quite startling. If you look at the list of courses that are formally offered, that are on the books, it looks like this is really a continuation of the old school in the sense that there are courses which are recognizably successors to the courses which, for me, were the core of the curriculum: the organization of materials, the selection of materials, the information service, what you do for people, and so on. So it looks like what had happened was that the school was given a new name and a new orientation but at the heart of the school was still a visibly similar professional core. What people would do for people would be recognizably the same kind of stuff.”[297] From 1995 to 2017 the only two schools of library education in California were at San Jose and UCLA. Since 1986, UCLA has been the only library school left standing in Southern California which has been in continuous operation since its founding.

When Edward Dickson founded UCLA one thing that was of utmost importance to him was the placement of a founder's rock to give a sense of establishment and permanency of place. According to Sumner, “He had this terrible passion down there for instant tradition. You can’t get instant tradition, but he wouldn’t recognize that. He tried hard. That’s why he wanted founder’s rock, that’s why he wanted a senior row of trees, why he wanted all these things,

---

because he harped back to Berkeley with its tremendously older traditions.” 298 Throughout his lifetime, Edward Dickson displayed as strong an adherence to the “School of Library” as he did founder's rock, yet tragically his life was cut short before he ever had the chance to see it. One cannot doubt that were Dickson alive to have read the articles of Bennett and Lewis that he would have had quite the impactful response, given his reputation as a banker, businessman, anti-communist, Regent, and adamant supporter of the Library School and Lawrence Clark Powell. One can only speculate his reaction, as one may only speculate Dickson's reaction to UCLA today and all that the library school has become. Now doubt he would be proud to see the bustling campus he had envisioned having grown even larger and more populated than he had ever seen, and to see that his “School of the Library” has weathered the decades including a rocky start with angry critics and a time of decommissioning which later plagued the other, previously-established schools. One only can hope that the library school at UCLA may be seen as a fragment of the founder’s rock, in that, in a way, it is a fragment of the very core of one of its most notable founders’ vision as well as of his very being. In light of its significance in the scope of legacy, history, and in librarianship as both a profession and an academic discipline, should the discussion of its decommissioning or dismissal of ALA accreditation ever arise at UCLA, it is hoped that such talk be strongly reconsidered.

298 Wutkee, “The Godfather of UCLA, cha” Interview with Ann Sumner, 82.
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